We do not take possession of our ideas, but are possessed by them.
They master us and force us into the arena.
Where, like gladiators, we must fight for them.—*Nemo.*

25 CENTS

The ARENA

EDITED BY
JOHN CLARK RIDPATH, LL.D.
and
HELEN H. GARDENER

MARCH, 1897

BOSTON: ARENA COMPANY { PIERCE BUILDING COPLEY SQUARE

AGENTS: PARIS { Brentano's, 17 Rue de l'Opera
Librairie Galignani, 224 Rue de Rivoli

Single Numbers, 25 cts. [Vol. XVII., No. 88.] Per Annum, $3.00

University Press: John Wilson & Son, Cambridge, U.S.A.

BOOK REVIEWS.

RAJA YOGA.[1]

REVIEWED BY S. ELLEN WALDO.

THERE comes to us from England an unassuming little volume bearing the above title, and written by Swâmi Vivekânanda, the Hindu monk who became a familiar figure in several American cities during the three years following the Parliament of Religions at Chicago.

Thanks to the efforts of Max Müller, Paul Deussen, and others, the Western mind has gradually been brought to take interest in Eastern philosophical thought, and many people in this country and in Europe are coming to realize that much can be learned from our brethren of the Orient.

In "Raja Yoga" we find a brief but comprehensive summary of a very ancient system of philosophy, through the whole of which runs a spirit of universal love and toleration that is worthy of all imitation.

However much we of the West may hesitate to accept the conclusions arrived at in this book, we can at least admire the plain and simple manner in which the writer sets forth his views, a manner in marked contrast to the usual mode of metaphysical expression. The subject dealt with in "Raja Yoga," namely, the method of mental analysis that will develop the psychic powers latent in man, is one that attracts attention from its novelty, as well as from that love of the marvellous and mysterious which seems to be inherent in human nature. It may fairly be said that the human mind is the most wonderful thing we know anything about, so that a certain fascination attaches to any teaching that offers us a new and possibly better method of investigating its more subtle workings.

"Raja Yoga" begins by assuring us that there is, and can be, nothing supernatural; everything in the universe is orderly and in absolute conformity to nature's laws. This Yoga, however, proposes to teach us more about those laws than we have hitherto known, and to enable us to arrive at a control of them that to our present point of view would seem impossible. It says that concentration is the

[1] "Raja Yoga, or Conquering the Internal Nature, also Patanjali's Yoga Aphorisms, with Commentaries," by Swâmi Vivekânanda, of India. 8vo. pp. x + 234; price $1. Longmans, Green & Co., London, New York, and Bombay.

only key to unlock any door in nature, and that if we learn the secret of concentration, we can dominate many of the forces that now rule us.

But the aim of Raja Yoga is far higher than this, which is but an incident by the way. The real object of practising this Yoga is to make this mental control a stepping-stone to getting beyond the mind itself and reaching that ultimate reality which is the background of all religion and of all existence. Raja Yoga, therefore, is both a philosophy and a religion. It tells us that "Each soul is potentially Divine. The goal is to manifest this Divinity within, by controlling nature, external and internal. Do this, either by work, or worship, or psychic control, or philosophy, — by one, or more, or all of these, — and be free. This is the whole of religion. Doctrines, or dogmas, or rituals, or books, or temples, or forms are but secondary details." The author gives us one method of gaining psychic control, but at every step he urges the importance of keeping constantly in mind the real aim of all our efforts, and warns us emphatically against being led aside by any lesser attainment, which might divert us from the path and delay us in reaching the true goal.

The first part of the book consists of class lectures given in New York, containing some simple directions for practice, together with explanations of the scope and aim of Raja Yoga. The second part is a somewhat free translation of the "Aphorisms" of Patanjali, with a running commentary upon them. There are several English translations of these "Aphorisms," but this is the first one I have seen that is made clear and comprehensible to a Western reader. Anyone can understand the meaning of the aphorisms, no matter how little he believes in what they teach. The first steps, at least, can be accepted by all, inasmuch as they inculcate a strict morality of the highest type, combined with a few rules for physical training conducive to the health necessary for the successful practice of Raja Yoga.

The succeeding steps may not seem so rational to us, but as Raja Yoga claims to be a science, and as every science has its own peculiar method, we must either accept that method or else refrain from pronouncing judgment upon a thing about which we are ignorant. In seeking to gain control of the mind, the Yogi wisely takes some physical help in the beginning, and, in order to tranquillize the nervous system, he prescribes certain exercises in breathing. It is simply absurd to suppose, as some have done, that "to breathe in through one nostril, and after holding the breath sixteen seconds, to breathe out through the other, will result in freeing our soul from the ties of flesh!" The Yogi himself would be the very last person to make such a ridiculous claim. All the use he makes of such ex-

ercises is to calm the nerves and the mind, so that the neophyte may be ready to take the next step, and by a series of purely mental disciplines, endeavor to lay hold of the mind itself and make it obey his will.

He has carefully analyzed the processes by which perception takes place, and adapts his efforts to the attempt to separate those processes at will, instead of allowing them to take place almost unconsciously. Modern psychology is trying to do something very similar, and has arrived at many of the results reached thousands of years ago by these patient Hindu investigators. The aim of the Yogi is so to train the more subtle powers of perception, that he will be able to perceive the finer manifestations of nature, manifestations that are ordinarily entirely overlooked. This, in turn, is but a step on the way to solving the one question, to the solution of which all the powers of the Hindu mind have ever been untiringly directed, — "What is That, knowing which, everything else will be known?" The Yogi claims that the answer has been found, and that the methods of discovering it have been formulated, so that every human being can get the answer for himself, if he has the real desire to do so. If a man wants truth as a drowning man wants air, it is certain that he will find it.

Almost everyone who attempts to hold his mind in check, and make it fix itself exclusively on one subject, finds himself unable to do this; his mind never wanders so much as when he tries to keep it fast to one idea. As there come times to all of us, when the power of fixed attention is most desirable, a little practice of some of the easier steps prescribed by "Raja Yoga" might be beneficial to every one. For those who desire to go farther and gain more complete mental control, the Swâmi's book maps out a regular method of procedure, where by slowly mastering one stage after another, they can conquer this unstable mind and force it to do their bidding. Of course, much patient, persevering effort will be necessary. There is no magical road to success. Those who have reached the goal, have usually worked hard and long. There are, however, many natures to which difficulties are but added incentives, and to such Raja Yoga offers a field worthy of their efforts. To strong, brave spirits, who are willing to subject the body to the mind, to forego mere physical gratifications for the higher pleasures of mental investigation and conquest, who are capable of perseverance, and who see in the goal set before them, that which more than all else is to be desired, — to such natures Raja Yoga appeals in the most forcible manner. Surely the goal is the grandest that can be set before man! What can man more desire than to arrive at a knowledge of his true nature, than to realize that he is one with Divinity itself!

The whole spirit of the book is candid in the extreme. It appeals to what is best and noblest in man. It makes no foolish mysteries, and demands no blind belief. It puts forth its system in a plain and simple manner. It is able to present its own method without in any way attacking the methods of others. It manifests a charity that it is usual to call "Christian," but which Vivekânanda proves is equally the property of the Hindu. If this little book had nothing to teach but the beautiful toleration it advocates, it would be well worth reading; but many will find in it valuable suggestions to aid in reaching the higher life.

A PROPHETIC ROMANCE.[1]

REVIEWED BY ELLEN A. RICHARDSON.

"A PROPHETIC ROMANCE, MARS TO EARTH," is another "Looking Backward" from a great future, when the planets shall have become as intercommunicable as the countries of our globe now are. Great changes are portrayed in all the methods of government, transportation, and in social relations.

The Lord Commissioner from Mars comes on an investigating tour to our Earth, and sends his daily messages back to Mars by telephone. He flies over our continent by methods of improved aerial travel, and by observing the motions of the earth, adapts its revolutions to his service, being thus enabled — through a mathematical calculation — to economize time in reaching the precise spot on earth which he wishes to visit on his mundane journeyings. By taking advantage of double motions of opposite directions it is demonstrated that in the journey between New York and San Francisco, time will become but an inconsiderable factor. The facilities for intercommunication by telephone are also wonderfully improved; seeing by telephone, as well as hearing, is an accomplished feat.

The work is flavored by a tale of love. Even the "old, old story" is supposed to have taken unto itself a new rendering under the touch of the unsparing finger of reform, and to have become a "new thing under the sun."

In this portrayal of the new condition of things, is furnished, by contrast, an occasion for criticism of present methods, an opportunity which the author has fully improved. He provokes a smile when he says, — "We left Chicago, feeling that the people of that great metropolis are more inclined to boast than are the people of any other part of the United States, or Mars. This, however, is said to

[1] "A Prophetic Romance," by Lord Commissioner.

have been a characteristic of Chicago since it was incorporated in 1835."

When the Lord Chancellor speaks of the United States as a nation, he says: "It is now believed that almost all the lawmakers and courts of law in the United States are honest. And when this can be said of any country, that country is safe."

Vegetarians will find that their struggles to educate the race out of the grossness of flesh-feeding will not have been in vain, but will eventually be crowned with success, according to this author, who says that all the slaughter-dens are turned into storehouses for fruits of the land and products of the field, the orchards, and the forests, instead of serving as "madhouses," as they had grown to be called by a sentiment which had developed against the sin of committing murder for the satisfaction of the appetite.

Only eight governments exist in the future order of things, the voting system is entirely corrected, and great humanitarian schemes will be in operation for the uplifting of the masses. The masses will look to the state much as a child looks to a good father and mother, for the state will try to make the masses contented and happy. In one chapter, "a rational system of finance" is dwelt upon, and the new schemes in use are discussed. The laws of mind and body, and their inter-relations, have become so well understood in this great future, that sickness and death are unusual except among the old.

The retrospection on all of the various phases of human existence, as taken up by the Lord Chancellor and the President of the United States, who is travelling in his company, explains the process of arriving at these more perfected states, and contains many suggestions for inventive minds.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC MYTHES AND MYTHE-MAKERS.[1]

Reviewed by Ellen A. Richardson.

"Socio-Economic Mythes and Mythe-Makers" does not deal with the myths of old-time lore, but strikes out straight for the myths existing in 1897, which are all held responsible for our present social and economic conditions. The author points to the ants and bees of the insect kingdom as "little folks," beings in the kingdom of invertebrata, using them and their habits as lessons in coöperative work. In fact, the author claims that the original economic condition of man was coöperative and helpfully interdependent, until multiplication of species and diversified forms came on with such

[1] "Socio-Economic Mythes and Mythe-Makers," by "Yours Truly."

rapid strides that there was interruption of this coöperative line of march, and self-consciousness became the omnipresent and all-powerful feeling, independence became selfishness, and unwise competition replaced helpful association. The social principle planted so strongly in the human breast has never been wholly discarded, though it browses on, and the optimistic author believes that "some day it will again have complete expression, albeit the process is piecemeal."

"Socio-Economic Mythes and Mythe-Makers" proclaims woman as the conservator of the social principle, its guardian, "protecting it by maternal emotions, fixing it in mother love." No matter how distorted the fraternal relations have become, the sentiment still holds which keeps intellects upon the rack, busily devising ways and means to again bring about fraternal associations in all the affairs of life.

The author quarrels not with the principle of self, supposed to be an expression of immortal will, but with the persistent stupidity of dealing with social attributes, especially with that sweet principle of human life, sympathy; and she asks the question, "What is it that interferes with the race's majesty of movement?" In answer to this question, we are given the reasoning of the book, and, as object-lessons help to show meanings, so the author helps us through the instructive recreation. A point is made, and called human; from the point a straight line is drawn, and called the human's intellect. "Aside from pleasantry," she says, "reasoning, we are well aware, permits latitude, and our precise geometric expressions become misleading; human dots get entangled, unnatural points press too close, natural points of contact do *not* adhere closely; in fact, straight lines become crooked, and crooked things are made to look straight, and this not only in the smallest details of life, but in the larger affairs which are regulated by legislative expediency." Thus the author leads us to understand the *modus operandi* of our deflections from original truth, and dubs the intellect, when acting as a ruler unassociated with the heart, as an "agitator" of harmful quality; but in coöperation with sympathy and love, it is called a "walking delegate," gathering into the organism images of things, and moulding them to fit the body's needs, thus helping on at the same time spiritual development and the greater knowledges for which we are all yearning.

"Socio-Economic Mythes and Mythe-Makers" states that knowledge consists of mental pictures, and personifies perceptive power as a master workman whom nature has provided to work by means of the five senses, with and for the spiritual entities, intuition and reason.

There are helpful philosophies throughout the volume. The style of writing is peculiar; it is as if the thoughts were flowing so rapidly that the words tumbled over each other, and subjects and predicates exchange places; while not infrequently the action is only suggested, and not made plain by the appearance of a verb. It is a book which must be read, whether silently or aloud, with well-studied inflection to be properly understood.

MODERN FAIRYLAND.[1]

REVIEWED BY HELENA MAYNARD RICHARDSON.

IN spite of the *isms* and *ologys* with which the children of the present day are supposed to be imbued, they none the less relish a fairy tale of nonsense as much as their brothers and sisters of yesterday, who were unburdened by the weight of precocious knowledge. What they may have learned in the concrete does not interfere, as a general thing, with their imaginations in the abstract, and a tale which has the charm of novelty, such as "Modern Fairyland," will of a surety appeal to each and every youngster. If, among these little men and women, some are overburdened with the skepticisms of greater learning, that lead them to scorn the company of the pet, familiar spirits of childhood, as old-fashioned and "not so," let them read and be convinced that Modern Fairyland, like themselves, is "up to date."

The story sets forth in graphic terms the efforts of one winsome fay, the Princess Fernitta, to modernize Fairyland. The dear little faithful hearts who cling to Fairyland as it was, may not entirely approve of the holocaust of changes that sweep over it and its midnight revels, flower dresses, honey bread, and happy-go-lucky manner of existence, and all that from time immemorial have been the essentials of the fairy world. But the Princess Fernitta looks upon these things with alien eyes, because, through the "wish" of the bad Fairy Grumble-Growl, she was changed into a mortal on one of her birthdays, and lived with mortals till she learned their ways. How long she remained a mortal the book does not tell us, perhaps because they do not take account of time in Fairyland. Of her sojourn among mortals, the book also maintains a discreet silence, but on her return, the Princess sweeps down upon the fairy world bent on reforming it altogether.

What a commotion she creates as soon as she gets hold of Puck's wishing wand! In fact, with her fussing and scolding, she behaves so much like the average reformer of mortals, that one is tempted

[1] "Modern Fairyland," by Elcy Burnham.

by all the loyalty to the wee fairies and Fairyland of all tradition, to quite resent her innovations; but, after all, she is such a pleasing little mite, with her *haut-ton* airs and her "progressive" notions, that we forgive her, and accept her dicta with the meek and subdued fairies.

In common with his brother and sister fairies, the Court Philosopher fares ill at her hands, when she considers him under the search-light of modern education, as the following may show:

He stumbled up to the Princess with a profound bow, and asking her to enlighten him on certain things, produced a scroll of prodigious size, and began to read off the exact words and phrases the Princess had used since her arrival. This struck the rest of the party as a great joke on the Princess, and they all covered their faces for fear of offending her with their laughter. The Princess, however, saw the fun too, and politely gave a definition for everything.

"You 're a Court Philosopher, and you have n't studied the etymology of words! That is bad," she exclaimed at the finish.

He looked up in amazement.

"Have you studied rhetoric?"

His mouth dropped open.

"Logic, natural philosophy, psychology," she continued, "and all the higher sciences?"

This was quite enough for the Court Philosopher, and he retired vanquished from the field.

Sprightly Puck abandons his post as a jester and merrymaker in the court of the fairies, and devotes his attention to law, so that he may hold the position of First Counsellor in the new capital city of Fairyland, and he wins the title of Sir Puck.

The tale winds up, as all good fairy tales should, with a happy marriage: that of Fernitta and Puck. The wedding ceremony is duly solemnized in Titania Chapel, and all goes happily ever after. "For further information concerning the nuptials send for a copy of the *Fairyland Evening Herald*."

Miss Elcy Burnham has a charming manner of story-telling for little folk. They are led into her wonder realm in such an entertaining fashion, that they are won as friends at the start, and, like Puck and the rest of the fairies, are her humble servitors at the finish. So, when she tells them that Fairyland is modernized, they are sure it must be so, even if in their heart of hearts they accept her verdict with a stifled sigh.

This clever story is made doubly pleasing to childhood's eyes by the "thumbnail" sketches which abound on the ample margins of its pages, and which serve to emphasize the dainty descriptions and to faithfully portray the actors in its dialogue.

The Arena.

VOL. XVII. MARCH, 1897. NO. 88.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICAN CITIES.

BY HON. JOSIAH QUINCY,
Mayor of Boston, Massachusetts.

OBSERVERS of modern municipal development on both sides of the Atlantic cannot but be struck with a curious anomaly. In some countries of Europe, where the administration of city affairs is controlled only to a very limited extent, or not at all, by the great mass of the citizens, municipal governments are conducted upon broader and more popular lines than in the United States, where universal suffrage prevails. In a certain sense, Berlin and Paris are actually more democratic than New York and Chicago. The people of the former cities have indeed nothing like the direct control over their city governments which those of the latter enjoy, in theory at least; but if we form our judgment not by the scope of the elective franchise, but by that of services rendered, we shall have to award the palm for variety and usefulness of municipal activity, for benefits conferred upon the masses of the people, to the foreign cities. An intelligent observer, with no other knowledge than that derived from a comparison of work done and results secured, would doubtless conclude that the people ruled more fully in Paris than in New York, in Berlin than in Chicago. In a score of different directions the interests of the average citizen are better and more fully cared for, his wants more fully met, in the great city of Europe than in that of America. Municipal government in the old world seems to be for the people, if not by the people.

My object in calling attention to this curious contrast between the theoretical character of city governments and the results they actually attain, is by no means to draw a comparison unfavorable to democratic institutions or universal suffrage. To an American, liberty of thought, of speech, of action, is even more desirable than perfection of administration; we would not be the subjects of an imperial master for all the advantages of Berlin. If we must choose, we prefer representative government even to good government. We would not exchange a poor administration representing the will of the whole people, susceptible of improvement as they become wiser, for a better one expressing only the ideas of a ruling class. To slavishly copy the methods of older communities would be as foolish as to decline to give any attention to their experience. But with the rapid increase in the population of our great cities, and the growing complexity of their life, we may well inquire whether we cannot learn something as to the lines of profitable municipal development in America by a study of the work done abroad. When a European city is found to be promoting the well-being of its people by services of a character not yet undertaken by our municipalities, the question should at once be asked, why cannot we, in our own way, do as much? The presumption should certainly be that the people of New York are capable of organizing any branch of public service which the city of Berlin finds it for the interest of its people to undertake.

There are three broad classes of municipal services: First, There are those which are of absolute necessity for the existence of a civilized urban community, such as the construction of streets, water-works, and sewers, or the maintenance of police and fire departments, of hospitals and almshouses. Second, There are those which are now considered indispensable, if not of primary necessity, such as the inspection of certain articles of food, the regulation of the liquor traffic, the protection of the public health, together with the provision, either directly under the control of the city or through the agency of quasi-public corporations, of facilities for passenger transportation through the streets, and of gas and electricity. Third, There are those branches of public activity which provide for wants which are above the primary ones, which supply what may be called municipal conveniences or privileges; under this heading fall libraries and facilities

for higher education, parks, playgrounds, public baths, gymnasia, and facilities for recreation or comfort.

The principles of sound administration are very simple, and they are the same in America as in Europe. To make any executive organization efficient it must have a head — whether elected by universal suffrage, chosen by a select body, or appointed by the central government — who is intrusted with proper powers of control and direction. Perfect men would doubtless make any system of government produce good results; men as we find them only do satisfactory public work when it is properly systematized, coördinated, and controlled. If a large American city wants good government, it must intrust to some one man the full power of executive direction. The successful performance of any important branch of work in a great city calls for careful and intelligent organization and constant watchfulness. To obtain results as good as those reached abroad we must, through universal suffrage, secure the adoption of the systems and methods best adapted for the purpose, and the appointment of administrative officers of the requisite capacity. The task of directing any important department of a great city calls for ability of a high order. Public opinion must be educated up to the point of demanding that, whatever play may be given to political forces, only men of the requisite qualifications shall be intrusted with high municipal office. This country is as rich as any in the world in capable administrators of large affairs; with proper city charters and the right men intrusted with power under them, we can immensely raise the standard of city administration in a short period of time.

A very large and important part of modern municipal work is of a purely technical character. The engineer, the landscape gardener, the architect, the physician, and other men of professional training have to be intrusted with it, either as regular officials or through special engagements. It is of the first importance to a large city to have a regular and capable professional force, maintained upon a permanent basis, independent of political changes; and this is perfectly possible even when the party system of government prevails. It is cheaper to have a dual organization, one political and one technical, than to forego the advantages of having trained and experienced experts connected with every branch of work. When outside professional work or advice is required

for special pieces of work, the rule that only the best talent is good enough for the city should be constantly laid down and adhered to. The amount of public money that has been largely wasted in our American cities in erecting buildings designed by second or third rate architects is something not pleasant to contemplate. An aroused public opinion can readily control matters of this character.

The question whether such public services as lighting, by gas or electricity, and passenger transportation in the streets, should be intrusted to corporations or performed directly by the municipality, is one which is giving rise to a great deal of discussion in this country, and the sentiment in favor of municipal ownership is unquestionably growing. The fact that franchises and locations in the streets have been so universally given to private corporations in our great cities, and that an enormous amount of capital has been invested in their securities, makes any attempt to inaugurate the European practice of public ownership, with operation either directly by the city or under a lease from it, exceedingly difficult. But aside from the question of dealing fairly with vested interests, there seems to me to be no reason why an American city should not take up any service of this character which may be recommended by business and financial considerations. There is no principle that stands in the way, for instance, of the municipal ownership and operation of an electric-light plant. It is purely a commercial question in each particular case. The electric-lighting business in particular, with the present improved dynamos and engines, is one which a properly organized city ought to be able to conduct for itself with some economy and advantage.

The argument is sometimes made that new fields of work of this character cannot safely be entered upon until the civil-service system is more firmly established in our cities, and their general standard of government is higher; but it does not seem to me that such reasoning rests upon a sound basis. Any extension of municipal functions must tend to arouse a public interest which cannot but assist in improving administration and hastening the adoption of a strict civil-service system. The indifference of the more intelligent and well-to-do citizens, and their willingness to vote their party tickets blindly, while exercising little or no influence over party nominations, is the curse of many of our cities. Business

men of large and unselfish views can control a city government if they will take the pains to do so. If some extension of municipal functions in the directions above indicated would arouse some who are now apathetic to a sense of their vital interest in sound administration, it would do a good work. We should not therefore wait for a perfect municipal organization before we undertake any desirable addition to the services now rendered directly by the city, but should be willing to trust something to the educating and awakening effect of imposing further responsibilities upon a municipal government, and thus bringing it into a new and close relation with the citizens.

It should also be borne in mind that municipal ownership does not necessarily involve municipal operation. Even the highly organized cities of Europe, with their permanent civil-service systems, find it better policy to lease certain franchises for a term of years than to operate directly such branches of public service as street-railway systems or gas-works. Many who are alarmed at the suggestion that an American city should manage a great and intricate electric-railway system, with its hundreds or even thousands of employés, are quite willing to consider fairly, as a question chiefly of finance, the proposition that a city should acquire the ownership of the street-railway locations and tracks in its streets, with a view to leasing them on proper terms and conditions for a period of years. It does not follow because municipal operation may be decidedly inexpedient that public ownership and control may not be desirable and beneficial.

In the case of electric-lighting plants, the conditions are such that ownership and operation naturally go together. The comparative simplicity of this service, and the present perfection of apparatus, make it a peculiarly favorable field for municipal enterprise. There are certainly many considerations in favor of placing the lighting of public streets, grounds, and buildings, at least, upon a municipal basis. Indeed, it seems to me that the case is so clear that the only question for a large city to consider is what legal difficulties or other embarrassments there may be in terminating existing relations with private companies. In the present state of development of electricity and steam, any competent city engineer should be able to calculate the expense of installing, maintaining, and operating an electric-lighting plant for a

given duty. Of course, if a city has not a competent technical and administrative force, it cannot successfully install and operate an electric-light plant; but neither can it properly build and maintain streets without such a force. The latter work calls for scientific and practical knowledge, as much as the former; if a city government is properly organized for the one service, it can easily be adapted to the other. If looseness in methods of accounting and book-keeping is tolerated, of course the real cost of electric-lighting will not be shown; but neither will that of other branches of municipal service. Aside from the question of general public lighting, every large city should maintain a force of its own for doing all the electrical construction and repair work required in connection with its public buildings and institutions. Electricity must play a large part in the service of every progressive city, and everything pertaining to its use should be brought under the charge of a properly organized department of the city government.

Only the business considerations in favor of municipal ownership have been hitherto touched upon, but the broad political considerations are even stronger. The power now necessarily wielded by the great corporations which control such branches of public service as lighting and transportation often gives them too great an influence over municipal governments. It has been said that the government must either control corporations, or be controlled by them. Without fully accepting this sweeping declaration, it must be admitted that there have been many cases in our American cities where corporations have practically dictated the action of city councils. Their influence over nominations and elections, where they choose to exert it, may often be a determining one. Even a corporation holding a municipal franchise that has nothing further to ask of the city, and only desires to be allowed to prosecute its business without interference, is often drawn into municipal politics by the skilfully planned attacks of politicians who have purposes of their own in view. In short, the connection between quasi-public corporations and the city is necessarily so close that corporate interests are bound to make themselves powerfully felt at times, both by their command of capital and by their influence over large numbers of employés.

The great problem of municipal government under universal suffrage is to reduce the play of purely selfish or indivi-

dual interests, so that elections may be decided upon broad grounds affecting the great mass of the citizens. The modern municipality touches so many people in such a variety of ways, and is necessarily brought into collision with so many private interests, that any narrowing of the scope of such interests is for the public good. It may be urged, on the other hand, that the influence of the additional city employés made necessary by the taking over of branches of service now performed by corporations will be equally great and equally selfish; but experience proves pretty conclusively that this is not the case. It has frequently been demonstrated that any influence which may be exerted by municipal employés in favor of a party in power is likely to be fully offset by the opposition of those who have been disappointed in obtaining public office or employment. And even those engaged upon city work are sure to have grievances, real or imaginary, against the administration in power, and are never solidly united in its favor. Moreover, with the extension and firmer establishment of the civil-service system, public employés are coming to feel fairly secure of their positions, regardless of political changes.

In respect to the third class of municipal services above mentioned, namely, those falling under the head of conveniences or privileges, the American city has been far behind its European prototype. In the variety and excellence of public facilities for healthful exercise, both indoors and in the open air, for bathing, and for the convenience and recreation of the people, we have much to learn from what has been done abroad; but we are fast waking up to this fact, and are beginning to supply these deficiencies. Whatever theories may be entertained as to the proper limits of municipal service, or as to the purposes for which money raised by taxation may properly be spent, the doctrine that a city may advantageously assume any functions generally beneficial to its citizens has in our time become firmly established in theory, and is fast being put into practice. Steps in the direction of what may fairly be called municipal socialism are undertaken with the full support of strong opponents of state socialism, in its broad aspect. The question where to draw the line has now become one of expediency, or of financial limitation, scarcely one of principle. A large degree of paternalism is already an accepted fact in every great and pro-

gressive American city, and irresistible forces are constantly tending to widen still further the field of public action.

The wonderful growth of interest in athletics and in various kinds of outdoor sports which has taken place in this country within recent years, has naturally directed attention to municipal gymnasia, playgrounds, and baths. The public is awakening to the fact that these can be supplied by municipal agency at an expense which is very small in comparison with that incurred for many other purposes, or when measured by the widespread benefits conferred. Facilities for cleanliness, for physical development, and for healthful recreation tend to the social and moral development of the masses of the people. The duty of a city is to promote the civilization, in the fullest sense of the word, of all its citizens. No true civilization can exist without the provision of some reasonable opportunities for exercising the physical and mental faculties, of experiencing something of the variety and of the healthful pleasures of life, of feeling at least the degree of self-respect which personal cleanliness brings with it. The people of a city constitute a community, in all which that significant term implies; their interests are inextricably bound up together, and everything which promotes the well-being of a large part of the population benefits all.

Even from a purely economical standpoint, the provision of the municipal facilities above referred to is fully justifiable, through their effect in increasing the capacity of men and women to perform useful service, whether manual or mental. The people of a city live by labor; they grow practically nothing from the soil, but they exchange their products or services for food grown by others, perhaps many thousands of miles away. Everything which increases the efficiency of labor, whether of the head or of the hand, increases the capacity of producing or of serving, and therefore adds to the means of livelihood of the community as a whole. The man or woman who is rested and stimulated by healthful change of occupation and by new ideas, who is afforded some opportunities of development, of enjoyment, and of social contact, becomes a more efficient agency for the production of wealth, to look at the matter from the lowest point of view.

But there is a much higher and truer standpoint. If any civilization is purely material in its aims, if it regards the masses or mankind merely as human machines for doing cer-

tain work, or as animals to be housed and fed merely that an appointed task may be performed, it will deservedly perish. The social elevation of man must, indeed, rest upon a secure material foundation. He must work, with all the powers with which he has been endowed, in order that he may have sufficient food, clothing, and shelter. But he does not work for these alone; they are but the foundations upon which he is to build. The object of his existence is the development of all his faculties, physical, mental, and spiritual. Toil is a necessary part of his training, but recreation is a part scarcely less important.

In cities, men are brought more closely together and have a greater number of vital interests in common than in the country. The sentiment of municipal solidarity is constantly growing, and the conception of the true functions of the city government is constantly widening. If socialism is ever attempted, it will come through great cities, not through agricultural settlements. In the great city, universal suffrage is subjected to its most crucial test; the results of that test, so full of import to humanity, will be estimated in the twentieth century. If the nineteenth century — as the period of municipal evolution in the United States — has contributed its full share of waste, inefficiency, and corruption, it can show some great achievements. There are encouraging signs that its closing years will be signalized by the growth of a sounder and broader civic spirit and a higher conception of the duties and opportunities of a great municipality. For the accomplishment of results of far-reaching beneficence, nothing more is needed than that the same American intelligence, energy, and determination to succeed, which have gained such notable victories in every other field of commercial and intellectual activity, should apply themselves to the special problems presented by city governments. But these must be approached with full confidence that they can be solved. Without shutting our eyes to past failures or existing defects, let us not lose one whit of belief in the beneficent workings of the principle of political equality when it is given a fair chance. Let us set up a high ideal of what a city government should be, and of what it should do for all its citizens, and then proceed, with reasonable caution but also with manly courage, to undertake any function, or to discharge any duty, which tends to promote the well-being of the people.

THE SOLIDARITY OF TOWN AND FARM.

By DR. A. C. TRUE,

Director of the Office of Experiment Stations, United States Department of Agriculture.

BETWEEN 1870 and 1890, speaking relatively and in round numbers, two million men gave up farming and went to join the great army of toilers in our cities. Taking their families into account, six million people from the farm were added to the population of the town; or, to put it in another way, in 1870, according to Carroll D. Wright, 46.72 per cent of all the persons engaged in gainful occupations were employed in farming. In 1890 only 36.44 per cent were so employed. The farms lost ten per cent in these twenty years. The same causes which produced that great movement of population to the towns are still operative. The rush to the cities continues, and will continue. Nor is this movement confined to this country. The same thing has taken place in Europe. Such cities as Berlin and Budapest have grown in recent years almost as rapidly as Chicago or Buffalo.

For this tendency to leave the farm and seek his fortune in the town, it is common to lay great blame on the shoulders of the farmer's boy. He is popularly supposed to be an uncommonly restless person who, weary of the dull routine in which he has been reared, and attracted by the glare and excitement of city streets and pleasures, leaves the plough in the furrow, and, without so much as casting one look backward in regret for separation from old friends and associations, hastens to mingle in the strife and turmoil of the town. By many he is sneered at as a very foolish boy who comes to town in total ignorance of the hard conditions of the average city worker, thinking to leap with a few bounds into fame and fortune. Thrilling tales are often told of the desperate struggles and sufferings of the would-be merchant or banker, until he finally sinks in sullen despair to his rightful station as street-car driver or motorman.

Many good people have thought that if we could in some way surround the country youth with more comforts and

pleasures, if we could relieve the solitude and monotony of the farm, he would stay at home and become a wiser and a better man. Various schemes to this end have been devised, and have come to naught. Not discouraged by repeated failures, philanthropists have kept up their strivings in this direction. They have even hoped to make country life so attractive that great numbers of city people would move out of town, and thus relieve the congestion in certain districts and industries of the city. Nothing is more common than to revile poor people in the slums of our great cities because they will be so foolish as to herd together in tenement-houses and foul-smelling alleys, when they might be out on quarter-sections breathing the pure air of heaven and looking abroad over the boundless areas of vast prairies. It is true that, since the Commissioner of Labor has assured us that people in slums have on the average about as much money as other people, and that the bacteria which inhabit their stuffy rooms are not particularly dangerous, we have perhaps been more inclined to leave the slums to their dirty happiness, and content ourselves with thanking God that we are not as other men — even these city-loving ragamuffins. Still, the talk about preventing the rush to the cities goes on. Lately, however, a few students of modern life have come to see and to say that, while present industrial conditions continue, the movement of populations to cities will continue. The fact is that, broadly speaking, men leave the farms because they are not needed there.

The introduction of labor-saving machinery and rapid transportation has produced the same result in agriculture as in other kinds of manufacturing. A smaller number of men working in our fields turn out a much greater product than the greater number of laborers could possibly secure in olden times, and the products of all lands are easily carried to where they are needed. For a time in this country cheap land, superficial methods of cultivation, rapid development of farm machinery, and the swift increase of population engaged in mining and manufacturing enabled our farmers to extend their operations with profit, and to give employment to thousands of new men. But gradually, and more rapidly within the past twenty-five years, invention has gained the mastery in agriculture as in other arts. The brain of man has triumphed over his hand here as elsewhere. Enough is pro-

duced to feed and clothe the world. Fewer workers per acre are required. The horse or the machine, steam or electricity, has taken the place of the boy or the man. Make farm life never so attractive, and there will be but little difference. There are more birds in the nest than the parents can take care of. Some must get out and pick up their own living abroad, or else all will be poorly nourished. It is not love of the town so much as necessity to earn a livelihood off the farm which drives boys to the town and makes them competitors in the great industrial struggles at the centres of population.

The clear apprehension of the great fundamental fact that the conditions of agriculture are steadily approximating to those of our other great industries is very important at this crisis in the industrial life of the world. The individual farmer needs to see this in order that he may conform in his business to those sound rules of procedure which experience has shown to be necessary to success in other branches of industry. To be successful to-day the farmer must think and work as other business men think and work. In order that he may come into sympathy with the workers in other lines who are studying and struggling to improve their industrial environment, he needs to see that the industrial problem of agriculture is the same as that of other industries. Hitherto it has been common among a certain class of conservative thinkers on industrial problems to set the farmers off by themselves as a class firmly fixed in old ways and traditions, who could be safely counted on to oppose change, and who could be used politically and otherwise to counterbalance the radicalism of workers in other industries. The farmer is beginning to arouse himself to the real merits of the great labor controversy, to feel that he cannot afford to be a mere buffer against which agitation may recoil, to see that at bottom his interests are one with those of the toilers in the factory and the mart.

On the other hand, the city worker needs to be brought more fully into sympathy with the farmer, and to see that the changes going on in agriculture are promoted by the same general causes which affect the city industries. He should see that the farmer is forced to leave the farm, that he comes to town to compete in the labor market on the same terms as other men, that in the working out of plans for bettering in-

dustrial conditions the surplus labor of the farm must be given its proper share, and a large share, of attention. It is well also that the city worker should realize that his competitor from the farm brings to town a stock of firm health and persistent vitality which will be a great factor in determining success in industrial efforts and effecting changes in industrial organizations in both places. When once men in both town and farm come to see that this is so, when they join hands to promote their mutual interests, we shall come more rapidly to a wise and permanent solution of the problems which perplex and annoy us all.

As long as the farmer says to himself, "I am not needed on the farm, there must be place for me in the town. I will go and mingle in the busy life there, trusting to my superior vigor to gain me the mastery over my sharp-witted city competitor," — regardless of the fact that there are too many workers in the town already, — there will be disappointment for the newcomer, or suffering for the man whom he displaces. As long as the city man says to his unsuccessful brother, "Go out into the country and raise cabbages. There is plenty of air and work out there. Why will you starve in your miserable garret in the town?" — regardless of the fact that farm products are already a drug in the market, and farm machines are daily crowding more workers off the farm, — there will be little hope of bettering the condition of industrial life in either city or country. But when both city and country workers say, "We are in the same fix. There are too many of us working at one thing. We must devise methods to diversify our industries, to raise the level of wages and expenditures, to more fully organize and perfect the system of distribution of products so that the wants of all men will be more fully met and the general conditions of life be more comfortable," then there will at least be greater reason to hope that in some way men will find a solution for problems which our age seems to find insoluble.

It is, I think, very desirable to lay stress upon the great common interests of town and farm at this time, because in some important ways the superficial tendencies of modern industrial development have seemed to widen the breach between city and country life. Thus far the tide of industrial success seems to have run in the direction of vast accumulations of wealth in the hands of a few men, accompanied with

the rapid development of vast hives of industry where these accumulations are stored. Not only is the modern city populous; it is exceedingly rich in all that can gratify the palate, the eye, the cultivated taste of mankind. And in our own country the pomp and glory of the city are no longer a thing which belongs to the state and seems to reflect the greatness and power of the community. It is rather the material success of the individual which is impressed upon the visitor to Boston, New York, or Chicago. The magnificent private residences, the lofty business houses, the great railroad depots, — these represent solely the fact that some men have been more successful than their fellows in the fierce warfare of modern industrialism.

In other civilizations the palaces of kings and nobles, the gorgeous equipages and ceremonials, were, and are still, felt to belong in a sense to all the people, and to be necessary to the maintenance of the power and prestige of the nation. The peasant could not aspire to these things, it is true, but still he felt that he enjoyed a certain ownership of them. The farmer coming to town nowadays naturally feels that he has no lot or part in the great things of the town. If he is to have any, he must come and struggle for it with the rest.

The increase and concentration of wealth in large towns have also produced complex social habits and distinctions which make the country man feel less and less at home there. From close contact the poorer city man is able to maintain at least a weak imitation of the social life of his more fortunate neighbors. But the country man, coming infrequently to town, hardly knows how to act in the city, and is mystified and distressed by the unexpected situations of city life which confront him at every turn. This has been intensified by the efforts of our "smart set" in recent years to ape the manners of transatlantic society. In fact, we may say that in certain quarters there has been a studied effort to build the artificial barriers of caste, to create here, as in the Old World, a class of peasants, and put into it all tillers of the soil.

And so in various ways the disparities between city and country life have been magnified, until many have really thought that farm and town had no interests in common, but that one should be set over against the other in an eternal industrial enmity, and that the farmer was being relegated to a position of obscurity and menial service. But I believe that

these separating tendencies which occupy so much of the attention of the popular mind to-day are only superficial, and that down underneath them is an irresistible current of common interest and sympathy which is drawing men closer together to work for human elevation and welfare. To those who fondly imagine that it would be a good thing to restore the old system of classes it is perhaps enough to urge the folly and danger at such a time as this of exaggerating the differences of life and condition which seem to separate men, or to set up artificial barriers to prevent the free movement from one kind of life to another. Moreover, to assert that this is actually the trend of society is at variance with the facts of modern progress. For, however great the differences in wealth, the tramp and the millionaire to-day are a thousand times nearer in sympathy and in estate than the feudal baron and his serfs, or the Roman senator and his slaves. Barriers of caste, of law, and of custom have been broken down. One or two yet remain. What useless labor to try to build again what our fathers have destroyed! Let us rather find a way to break down the rest.

When once the dwellers in town and farm realize that at bottom the same serious problems of life confront them all, they will, it seems to me, cultivate a kindly spirit toward each other, and be pleased to study in detail the ways in which town and farm are interdependent or may be mutually helpful. Let us very briefly consider a few points of contact between farm and town, with a view to promoting plans for the benefit of both.

From the farm the city largely gets the fundamentals of physical life, of manufactures, and of commerce. Foods, fibres, and wood — how dependent the city is on the supply and quality of these things! Business men know how much depends on the success or failure of the crops. However much the relative importance of agriculture may decline as our industrial system grows more complex, it must always remain one of our greatest industries. The farm will always be a large factor in the commercial prosperity of the town. What folly then to propose or attempt any scheme of trade, transportation, or finance based on the selfish interests of either town or farm alone! If our smart city broker overreaches his country brother, and chokes up the natural channels of trade, a few men may amass fortunes on 'change, but

the ruin of the farmer will drag down the prosperity of the average city dweller as well. Great accumulations of wealth, wrung out by any unfair dealing with the multitude of toilers on our farms, will ruin our great cities and the civilization they represent just as surely as the treasures of plundered provinces enriched but destroyed the city of the seven hills. If the farmer borrows hard cash of his brother, and then is persuaded to plead the homestead act, or any other poor excuse to repudiate half his debt, the city man is not the only sufferer. The farm must pay its honest debts as well as the town.

The business interests of both farm and town can only rest on a solid basis of enduring prosperity when all join together to devise and carry out an honest and just policy. The great problem of the equitable distribution of the products of labor on farm and in factory will not be settled until the common concern of both town and farm, in a just settlement, is acknowledged and acted upon.

From the farm come in large measure the strength and vigor of great cities. Call the roll of great manufacturers, merchants, bankers, teachers, preachers, and officials in any large city, and you will be surprised to find how many of these leaders in metropolitan enterprise are graduates of the farm. Can these forget the mother who bore and nursed them? Or can those who cheerfully follow their leadership neglect to pay the debt of gratitude they owe the farm for providing such high service? Is it not a matter of some concern to the town in what atmosphere that strong body of its citizens sure to come to it from the country is reared? Can the city afford to do anything to destroy the purity or independence of farm life, or to reduce the farmer's family to the condition of a stolid and unprogressive peasantry? When the new blood that flows into the city's arteries is tainted or diluted at its source, what reason have we to expect that the city's moral health or vitality will continue? History shows that it will not.

To a greater extent than most men are aware of, the health of a great city depends on the quality of the products which it receives from the farm. We are beginning to appreciate that it is not only the city dealer in provisions whose business methods we must inquire into, but also the farmer's ways in raising or treating the products he brings to town. Already

boards of health insist on inspecting dairy farms. The United States Government inspects the meat as it is received at our great cities. Is not the town interested to know whether hog cholera, or trichinosis, or tuberculosis is raging among the live-stock on the farm. What kind of bacteria makes the flavor of your butter, or whether milk or oleomargarine fills your cheese, is a matter of some concern to the city dwellers. And beyond this the nutritive quality of the meat, flour, and vegetables your city markets afford may affect your life and happiness. Your purses, too, will be affected by the kind of farming done in the neighborhood of your city. In the vicinity of a certain city the farmers are too ignorant or too lazy to raise good chickens or vegetables. The market men are obliged to send long distances to get the grade of produce demanded by their customers. I have no doubt both farmers and citizens in and near that city curse the middlemen for poor returns and high prices. Can a city afford to be surrounded by an unintelligent and shiftless yeomanry?

I happen to be the representative of the United States Government in its efforts to make more intelligent farmers by means of agricultural colleges and experiment stations, and to teach the people that there is a relation between good, pure, and sufficient food and the vigor and progressiveness of the population. Are not the interests of town and farm in such questions mutual? When we seek to train better farmers, and to produce better food, do we not at the same time subserve the welfare of the city dwellers? I am glad to note that people are beginning to appreciate the interrelation of farm and town in these fundamental matters. I only wish that such a spirit might be reflected in the debates and in the organization of committees under the dome of the great capitol at Washington. Too often a narrow class-spirit seems to pervade those august halls, and there seems to be a delight to stir up strife rather than to consider the best interests of all the people. Let us have men from both farm and town on the committees when measures affecting agriculture, manufactures, or commerce are being considered. It is the people's business, not that of any class or clique.

The great change which recent times have brought in the summer habits of city people is an ever-increasing means of bringing into clearer light the common interests of farm and town. In New England especially, the value of the farm and

of its products depends more and more on its availability as a summer residence for city people. And these city boarders are beginning to see that the farmer's surroundings and mode of life may largely affect them for weal or woe. Bad cooking at a farm-table has ruined the digestion and health of many a city dweller who fondly imagined that the larger air-space of the country was all that was necessary to give him renewed vigor of mind and body. Many a sojourner on a farm has brought back typhoid fever to blight his happiness all winter, if not to end his life altogether. The location of the farmer's barns and outbuildings, with reference to the pollution of the domestic water supply, has thus become a matter of vital importance to thousands of city dwellers.

Of still more importance are the mental and moral conditions of the farmer's family and his hired help, as affecting especially the boys and girls who go from the city to spend their summer vacation on the farm. And on his side the farmer may well consider what sort of people they are whom he brings from town to associate so closely with his own children. Do they come to inculcate extravagant notions of living, and sow the seeds of discontent in his family? Do they bring a low moral atmosphere with them, or are they ready to throw off proper restraint of manners or morals simply because they have come into the country? Have we not all seen city boarders who excused their boorish conduct on the ground that it did n't matter much what they did "on a farm"? Some years ago I knew a little rural community where labor was seriously demoralized by a wealthy city family who paid extravagant wages or fees, and gave their workmen "free beer."

There are evidently two sides to the problem of "summer boarding," and farm and town would do well to get together to discuss them.

The bicycle seems destined to be an important factor in setting people to thinking about great problems of modern life. Everybody is supposed to know what wonders the bicycle is to accomplish in "the emancipation of woman," whatever that may mean. But the effect of the bicycle on the transportation problem — one of the greatest problems of modern society — has hardly yet been realized. It may be truthfully said to have brought farm and town together on the matter of good roads. How all of a sudden thousands of city people

have discovered that it is a matter of vital importance that good roads shall be built to aid the farmer who hauls his produce into town, — and incidentally to accommodate the bicyclist who rides out of town! And now that farm and town have joined hands in this road-building, we may naturally expect that they will fall to discussing railway transportation by steam, electricity, or compressed air, until some of the ugly questions that have hitherto perplexed us regarding the economy and convenience of methods of transportation for city and country business and people are settled on the just basis of the common interest. The electric railway may also help to bring farm and town together. It will, moreover, spread out the town and make the conditions of town life approximate toward those of country life.

Efforts to better the conditions of farm life need the help of the cities. The cities should interest themselves in giving the country places good schools, libraries, and postal facilities; and in general should help in enriching the common life of the people. The wealth of the cities should contribute toward the bettering of farm life. It is not well that cities should draw definite limits and spend all their resources in building up and improving themselves. They have a duty toward the rural communities, not simply to yield to the demand of the farmers whether what they ask for is wise or not, but to take an active interest in their affairs and counsel with them, so that the best plans for mutual benefit may be devised.

The attempt to purify city politics and revive civic pride and self-respect is very encouraging. But this must not be done to the neglect of the interests of the State, which, after all, is the great unit of our national life. The State government deals with the great problems of marriage, education, health, transportation, industrial organization, etc., which profoundly affect the daily life of all the people.

There are those who think that our greatest failure in government is in the management of State affairs. The legislature is not close at hand, and so the ordinary citizen forgets his interest in it. It is not sufficiently elevated to draw public attention to it as does Congress. It is likely to be the refuge of mediocrity, if not of corruption.

In general, to sum up, the problem of our times is not how to send men back to the farms where they are not needed, not how to scatter population into myriads of little communi-

ties, but how to raise the level of farm life and farm product, to more thoroughly organize the great towns, to improve the means of communication between farm and town, and to harmonize the manifold elements which compose the modern state, so that each will do its appointed work in the best manner, and the interests of all the people will be conserved.

There is a grand old word used in Thanksgiving proclamations in Massachusetts which, taken to heart, should bring town and farm into closest sympathy. Let us never forget that, wherever we may dwell, strong bonds unite us as members of the "Commonwealth."

THE RELATION OF BIOLOGY TO PHILOSOPHY.[1]

BY PROF. JOSEPH LECONTE, LL.D.
Of the University of California.

IN the relation of biology to philosophy is found the key to whatever is distinctive in my own views. If the free spirit of man is naught else than the anima, or soul of animals born into a higher world, and the animal soul was itself evolved out of the general forces of nature, as I hold, then right here if anywhere we ought to find the key to the vexed problem of the relation of the spirit of man to nature, and of both to God. Surely, this is the most important problem of philosophy, if it be not the corner-stone of philosophy itself. The subject is far too large to be treated in a short paper, even if I were able to do so at all, which I am not. I shall be abundantly satisfied if, by removing some misconceptions of evolution contained in this chapter, and very widely prevalent in the popular mind, I may be able to clear up some points left obscure in my previous writings. My object in this paper is therefore twofold : first, to show the misconceptions of the author in regard to the nature and scope of evolution; and then to show that, properly understood, evolution is not excluded from the domain of human activity, as he seems to think.

The fundamental mistakes of Professor Watson (and of many other thinkers) are: first, the limitation of evolution to Darwinism, or organic evolution; and second, the limitation of Darwinism to natural selection. Thus, evolution becomes for the author synonymous with natural selection. Of these two grades of limitation I take up the latter first.

I. — DARWINISM *vs.* NATURAL SELECTION.

It is the fate of great thinkers that their disciples narrow their views to whatever is most distinctive, and ignore all the qualifications and extensions existing in the mind and ex-

[1] A Review and Criticism of Chapter vii. of Professor Watson's book entitled "Comte, Mill, and Spencer."

pressed in the writings of the broader-minded master. Darwin's theory of evolution, in so far as it is distinctive, consists in the introduction of the selective factors, namely, natural selection and sexual selection, but especially of the former. It was the discovery of these factors that put the theory of evolution on an acceptable basis. Evolution in a vague form had been held by philosophical thinkers from the earliest dawn of thought. Organic evolution also had been previously brought forward, not as a vague idea, but as a scientific theory, by Lamarck and others; but it had been repudiated by the most authoritative science as a fantastic speculation. But by the introduction of the selective factors, especially natural selection, Darwin made it credible to the intelligent popular mind and an effective working theory for the biologist. Thus it has happened that organic evolution has come to be associated in the popular mind, and even in the minds of some of the best biologists, with natural selection alone. The tendency to identify these has been greatly increased by the writings of Weismann and Wallace, who hold that natural selection is the sole cause of organic evolution. These great biologists write with so much confidence that the inexpert are imposed upon; and with so much power that they have attracted a large following (though by no means the largest) among biologists themselves. To read Weismann one would think that there was now no longer any room for doubt that natural selection is the sole factor of organic evolution; since, according to him, acquired characters cannot be inherited at all; and yet most German biologists take a very different view. Again, Wallace wrote a book taking the same view, entitled "Darwinism," thus implicitly pledging Darwin to this view. It ought to have been entitled "Wallaceism," not Darwinism, for Darwin would never have accepted any such extreme views.

Darwin everywhere and at all times, and more and more in successive editions of his great book, recognized and insisted upon the existence of many other factors besides natural selection, although, indeed, he regarded the latter as the most potent. Although some very distinguished English biologists agree with Wallace and Weismann, by far the greater number — including Spencer, Huxley, Romanes, and, as already said, Darwin himself — take a different view. In America, nearly all biologists take ground against the

extreme views of Weismann and Wallace. To distinguish these new views from true Darwinism, they have been called Neo-Darwinism. Now, as might have been expected, the eloquence and skill of these powerful writers, assisted by a previous tendency to identify organic evolution with natural selection, have deeply affected the minds of popular writers, leading some in the direction of a materialistic view of evolution and therefore of human progress, and others, by a revulsion from this extreme, into a dissociation, partial or complete, of human progress from organic evolution of any kind. Thus, to mention only two notable recent books, Kidd in his "Social Evolution" bases his whole reasoning on Weismann as the only true expression of evolution, and therefore removes moral and religious progress from the category of evolution, although in so doing he is compelled to remove them also from the domain of reason. The two fundamental fallacies of this book are, first, the unquestioning assumption of Weismannism; and second, the definition of reason as the activity of the human mind for purely selfish purposes. For him whatever is unselfish is thereby irrational. The other book showing the same tendency is Balfour's "Foundations of Belief." This book is wholly reactionary; and the reaction — as usual in such cases — is based wholly on an extreme materialistic view of evolution, and especially on an identification of evolution with natural selection. But my object now is not to criticise these books, but only to give them as examples of a misconception of evolution and even of Darwinism. Why the limitation of organic evolution to natural selection should have this effect, we shall explain later.

Now Professor Watson shares in the common misconception. He everywhere assumes the identity of Darwinism with natural selection. It is necessary, therefore, before going further, to characterize very briefly the various factors of organic evolution. I have already explained these more fully in another article to which I would direct those desiring a fuller account.[1] I believe that there are at least five known factors, and perhaps others unknown. The known, briefly stated, are as follow.

1. *Pressure of a Changing Environment.* Changed environment produces change of function, and therefore change of

[1] *Monist*, April, 1891, vol. i. p. 321.

structure of organs, and these changes, being produced by the environment and in harmony therewith, are selected and transmitted by inheritance and integrated through successive generations without limit so long as the pressure continues in the same direction. This, in the beginning, — in the earliest states of organic evolution, — was the *only* factor. It is still the only one in the lowest protozoa; and, in connection with natural selection, in all plants.

2. *Use and Disuse.* Use increases the size and strength of organs, or changes their forms; disuse produces diminution, obsolescence, and finally disappearance. These changes, small at first, are transmitted by inheritance and integrated through successive generations without limit, so long as the changes continue in the same direction. It is evident that this factor requires consciousness and volition, and therefore must be characteristic of animals as distinguished from plants.

In regard to these two factors, it is necessary to remember that the whole change occurring in one generation is *not* carried over by inheritance to the next, but only a very small and often an infinitesimal part. Otherwise, evolution would be rapid indeed. All the objections to the admission of these factors by biologists of the Weismann and Wallace school are the result of the non-recognition of this limitation. These two are called the Lamarckian factors.

3. *Natural Selection.* This, the most distinctive Darwinian factor, acts in an entirely different way from the other two. In the Lamarckian factor the change is wholly during the lifetime of the individual, and inheritance only transmits it unchanged to the next generation. It is a change or character acquired during the individual life. In natural selection, on the contrary, there is no change in the individual lifetime, or, if so, it is not inherited, but the change takes place in the offspring without the coöperation of consciousness or will, or, as it were, fortuitously, in all directions — divergent variation; and the effect of the environment is not to make changes, but only to select from those ready made, namely, those that are fit to survive. It is evident, then, that the operation of this factor is conditioned not on consciousness and volition, as the previous one, but wholly on sexual modes of reproduction. For the non-sexual modes of reproduction, such as by fission, budding, etc., may be regarded as only extensions of the in-

dividual, with all its acquired characters. In these modes of reproduction, therefore, there can be no such thing as the divergent variation of offspring, or, indeed, offspring at all in any proper sense.

4. *Sexual Selection.* — This is the result of the contest of the males, by combat or by display, for the possession of the female, and the greater success of the strongest and most courageous or the most attractive males, whereby the qualities of strength, courage, and beauty are perpetuated and increased from generation to generation indefinitely. This factor is, of course, conditioned on consciousness and will, and is therefore confined to animals, and even to the higher animals — especially to birds and mammals. These last two are the distinctively Darwinian factors.

The four factors above-mentioned are all recognized both by Darwin and by Spencer, but Spencer regards the first two, and Darwin the last two, as most potent.

5. *Physiological Selection.* — This may be defined as the segregation of varieties within the limits of inter-fertility, and their assimilation by cross-breeding to a common type called a species, and the correlative separation, more and more, of the mutually infertile varieties into distinct species. This factor was introduced after Darwin's death by Romanes and Gulick, and is undoubtedly of great importance.

It is easy to see now why I object so strongly to the limitation of organic evolution to the operation of the single factor, natural selection. For of all the factors above enumerated and characterized, this one seems most mechanical and materialistic in its tendency, and therefore has peculiar attractions for some biologists. Variation of offspring seems utterly fortuitous, and selection of the fittest, and destruction of all others, the most wasteful and unintelligent, though perhaps most effective, of all possible methods of improvement. Now, although of course no one believes in fortuity in the sense of causelessness, but only in the sense of a complexity of conditions and a delicacy of their balance so great as to render prediction of results impossible, yet surely such a process as natural selection is not suggestive of intelligent purpose, although certainly not inconsistent with it. Other factors, on the contrary, such as use and disuse, and sexual selection, being dependent on consciousness and will, lend themselves more readily to this conception.

II. — Evolution *vs.* Organic Evolution.

My second objection to the author's view (and I may say to that of a whole school of thought) is that he limits evolution to organic evolution. As Darwinism, or organic evolution, is far wider than natural selection, so evolution is far wider than organic evolution. In a word, there are several different kinds and grades of evolution, of which organic evolution is only one. There are in fact four very distinct kinds, — namely, 1st, Physical, or Cosmic; 2d, Chemical; 3d, Organic; and 4th, Human, or Rational, — each determined by a different force and carried forward by a different process, to reach a different goal. We take these in order.

1. *Cosmic Evolution.* — This is the gradual evolution of the present universal cosmic order out of primal chaos. It was determined wholly by physical forces, mainly by gravitative attraction. The details of the process are not exactly known, but the best attempt to formulate it is known as the nebular hypothesis. This is the most fundamental of all kinds of evolution, and was the first in the order of time. It preceded all, but continues through all, and forms the condition of activity — the theatre on which is enacted the drama of all other forms of evolution.

The other three are closely connected with one another in continuous series. Each has not only its own process, and is carried forward by its own characteristic force, but it has also its own definite goal, and then gives place to the next higher kind.

2. *Chemical Evolution.* — In the earliest stages of cosmic evolution, we have good reason to believe that matter existed only in elementary — or perhaps in still simpler — condition. Chemical affinity was overpowered and held in abeyance by intensity of primal heat, which we know dissociates all compounds. Such is the condition of things on the sun to-day. As cooling of the earth progressed, chemical affinity came into play, and compounds were formed. These, by repeated combinations and re-combinations, became more and more complex and unstable, until that most complex and unstable of all known substances, — so complex that we strive in vain to determine its exact composition, — protoplasm, was achieved. Chemical evolution could go no further. Since the dawn of life it has never gone any further. It had definitively reached its goal.

3. *Organic Evolution.* — But evolution did not stop there. For chemical evolution, in achieving protoplasm, achieved also the conditions necessary for a new and higher kind of evolution, namely, organic evolution, under the control of a new and higher force, and by a new and higher process — organization of the substance protoplasm. The course of evolution was taken up on to a higher plane under the guidance of life forces and by means of the general process of organization, but more specifically by means of the five factors already named as characteristic of this kind of evolution, and went forward to attain higher and higher forms of plants and animals, until finally it reached its goal and completion in man. It could go no further. Evolution has never gone any further on that line — that is, the line of organic evolution. Man is the highest possible animal. No other animal is now on its way man-ward or reason-ward.

4. *Human Evolution — Social Progress.* — But in achieving man and human reason, organic evolution achieved also the conditions necessary for a still higher kind. Evolution was therefore transferred to a higher plane, and carried forward by a higher force, — free will guided by reason, — by a higher process of organization, — social organization, — to form a higher kind of organism, — the body politic. Shall this also attain its end and complement? Yes, when it has achieved the ideal man, — the divine man, — and the ideal body politic, — the kingdom of heaven on earth. With the attainment of this last goal, the whole circle of evolution will have been completed. For it will have returned to the divine plane from which it originally descended, and returned not empty-handed, but bearing with it, as the fruits of the whole process, immortal sons of God.

Now, it is with this human evolution that we are especially concerned. It is necessary to sharply distinguish it from all other forms, but especially from organic evolution, with which it is often identified.

Remember, then, the five factors of organic evolution. By the operation of these the animal kingdom was brought up to the very door of humanity, — yea, more, man himself in his lowest form was thereby achieved. Now right here, that is, with man, was introduced another and higher factor, — a sixth factor, if factor it may be called (for it is much more than a factor), a factor not to be found in organic evolution, and

therefore not recognized by biologists, namely, the will of man guided by reason, consciously and freely coöperating with nature in the work of evolution. In all the lower forms of evolution the process is by necessary law, and without the coöperation of the thing evolving; man alone, and more and more as he rises in the scale of humanity, freely coöperates with nature in the work of his own evolution, until, in the highest individuals and in the most highly civilized communities, he takes the whole process mainly into his own hands.

I have called this a factor, but it is much more than a simple factor coördinate with other factors. It is rather another and higher nature determining another and higher kind of evolution. As physical nature uses all the five factors to carry forward a high organic evolution, even so the higher rational nature of man uses all these same factors to carry forward a higher kind of evolution on a higher plane. To distinguish this higher kind of evolution characteristic of man alone, we call it progress. I have already, on several occasions, given in detail the characteristics of this kind of evolution, and the great differences, even contrasts, between its phenomena and those of organic evolution. It is sufficient to say here that all these differences follow as a necessary consequence of the introduction of a higher nature, rational and moral, coöperating in the work of evolution and determining its course by a law of reason instead of a law of force, a law of freedom instead of a law of necessity.

But although we speak of human progress as a different *kind* of evolution, we do not mean that there are no beginnings and foreshadowings of coöperation to be found in the higher stages of organic evolution also. In some sense, and in an imperfect degree, some of the factors of organic evolution — for instance, use of organs, and sexual selection — suppose the coöperation of consciousness and will in the evolution of animals. But there is this difference: animals coöperate for immediate ends determined by desire only; man also for distant ends foreseen and approved by reason. Animals seek immediate ends, unknowing and uncaring whither they tend, — what may be their effect on evolution. Man, on the contrary, in addition to immediate ends, conceives a distant end, the "far-off divine event," — the ideal, — and consciously, voluntarily seeks this.

Again, the different kinds and grades of evolution are connected together in unbroken series, although, indeed, change

is more rapid at certain points. Thus, when chemical evolution was introduced, physical laws and forces were not thereby abrogated, but only subordinated to the higher chemical forces. They still underlay and conditioned the process of chemical evolution, which, therefore, is not only higher, but also more complex than the physical. Again, when organic evolution was introduced, chemical forces and laws were not abrogated, but only became subordinated to the higher life-force, and were used for *its* higher purposes. It still underlay and conditioned the whole process of organic evolution. So also when rational evolution, or social progress, was introduced, the factors of organic evolution were not abolished, but only subordinated to the still higher rational and social forces, and used by them for their higher purposes. They still underlie and condition the whole process. Thus in all and everywhere the higher dominates and uses the lower, but the lower underlies and conditions the higher, and the whole process becomes not only higher and higher, but more and more complex. But in each case the dominance of the higher is at first feeble; as we rise it becomes more complete. Thus, in social progress, man at first was mainly under the sway of organic factors, unknowing and uncaring whither he tended; but slowly the free voluntary striving after the higher in the individual and in society gained strength, until now it is almost the only factor.

Again, it is interesting in this connection to note the gradual change in the nomenclature of the forces of evolution as we rise in their grades. In physical and chemical evolution we speak only of necessary law and compelling forces, although indeed there is a difference even here, chemical forces being more special and individual than physical. When we come to organic evolution, we have life forces individuating, and to some extent self-active, and therefore we have here already a semblance of coöperation in evolution. We now for the first time speak of factors or modes of operation of life force in evolution. The name is appropriate only for this grade. In social progress we have for the first time a true, conscious, voluntary coöperation in the work of evolution, and therefore a great step in freedom. The word "factor" is no longer appropriate here. It is rather another *nature* using the factors for its higher purposes. Thus, we have, 1st, forces; 2d, factors; 3d, new nature.

Again, I have spoken of different kinds of evolution, and especially have insisted on human evolution, or social progress, as a different kind. I know that biologists insist that the difference between man and animals, and therefore between organic evolution and social progress, is one of *degree* and not of *kind*. Professor Watson objects to this, and insists that the difference is one of kind also. In this I think he is right; but he seems to think that this implies a break in the continuity of evolution and of natural causes. To this I object.

What do we mean then by differences in kind as distinguished from differences in degree? In pre-Darwinian times the distinction was plain enough. Differences of degree came by natural, differences in kind by non-natural or super-natural, processes. But now that we know that all differences came by a natural process of evolution, how shall we draw the distinction? Is it not evident that a difference in kind, since it came by evolution, is naught else than a great difference in degree? We call it a difference in kind when the difference is great and the intermediate shades have dropped out, as in the cases of all the differences in organic forms constituting species, genera, orders, classes, etc. Are not these different kinds? Or else when the change seems to have come somewhat suddenly with the introduction of new forces, properties, capacities, etc. We have abundant examples of this in chemical combinations. Surely the formation of water by the combination of oxygen and hydrogen is the sudden creation of a new kind of thing, and yet it is a natural process. Now, have there been any such sudden and great changes in the history of evolution? There certainly have been. In the earliest times of cosmic evolution, chemical compounds did not exist, chemism being held in abeyance by intense heat. By gradual cooling to a certain temperature, chemism came into being, a new force determining a new group of phenomena, the materials of a new science, chemistry, suddenly, perhaps, but still derived from physical forces by natural process, for we see the same taking place now. Ages passed away until the conditions were favorable, and *life* came into being, a new force determining a new group of phenomena forming the materials for a new science, biology. It must have come somewhat suddenly, but not therefore by other than a natural process. For the process takes place daily

and under our eyes. When the necessary conditions — sunlight, chlorophyl, and living protoplasm — are present, light and chemism change at once into life force, and mineral matter into living matter.

The difference, then, between the living and the non-living, the conscious and the unconscious, are certainly differences in kind, if there be any such at all. And yet these have come by a natural process. Equally great is the difference between the self-conscious and the non-self-conscious, the rational and the non-rational, the moral and the non-moral, — in a word between man and animals. May we not conclude, therefore, that this also, though a difference in kind, came by a natural process? It will be remembered that all these somewhat sudden changes, attended with the appearance of new and higher groups of phenomena, but especially this last one, I have compared to successive births. The most important of all these, as giving significance to all the others, is the birth of self-consciousness and reason in man. Now, what I contend for is that the apparent break in the continuity of appearance in these cases does not imply break in the continuity of natural causes and natural processes, any more than physical birth breaks the continuity of physical life.

I have now explained, and I hope justified, my objections to the author's view of evolution. His identification of evolution with organic evolution is perhaps excusable, for this is the most usual and perhaps the most authoritative scientific opinion, though I think it wrong; but for the identification of organic evolution with natural selection he is not excusable, for this is not the most common or authoritative view among biologists.

III.—The Teleological or Purposism View of Evolution.

But for the rest I find his criticism of prevalent evolution views eminently just. He is right in insisting that "Nature is in no sense a product of Chance; but must be conceived from the point of view of immanent Teleology." I would put it still more strongly. A teleological or purposism view of nature is naught else than faith in a moral order of the cosmos, and as such is a necessary postulate of our moral

nature, precisely as faith in a natural order of the cosmos is a necessary postulate of science. Yes, teleology is necessary, not teleology in any narrow sense, — not the watch-making, cabinet-making design of Paley and the older writers, not a special design for each particular thing as separate from other things, — but a design or rather a purpose affecting nature as a whole, embracing all space and stretching through all time, including, absorbing, and determining every separate design. It is not a design preceding its realization, for with God, thought and realization are one, nor operating on foreign material, for nothing is foreign to Him, but a purpose coexistent and coextensive with its realization. In a word, it is not a design in any human sense, but rather a law of eternal and progressive Divine self-revelation.

Now the fundamental vice of modern evolutionism is the ignorance of this wide teleological view of nature. This may be somewhat justifiable in strictly scientific work, although not entirely so even there, as we shall presently show; but biologists carry it also into their philosophy, where it has not justification. This state of mind is undoubtedly a revulsion against the narrow teleology of the older writers, and, as such, must be short-lived. But meanwhile, being a false view, it must and does lead to false methods of work in biological science itself. Let me explain.

There are two points of view from which we may regard nature, — the mechanical and the teleological, the fortuitous and the purposive. From the mechanical or fortuitous point of view we look for explanations in the beginning, because the process is simplest there. From the teleological point of view, on the contrary, we look for explanations at the end, for there only is the meaning or purpose distinctly declared. In the one, therefore, we pass from the simplest generalized beginnings upward, tracing every step of increasing complication, and this we call an explanation. In the other, contrarily, we first find the meaning, the purpose, the significance of the whole process as declared in the end, and then we trace backward the dimmer and dimmer foreshadowings of the same in lower stages. I have said that this latter point of view is not without its uses even in science. I must now show this.

There are two great departments of biology, namely, morphology and physiology. The one studies form and structure, the other function. Function always implies purpose. It is im-

possible to write about function without using the language of teleology. Darwin himself is compelled to use it, though he apologizes for it as a concession to common usage. But it is not a mere concession. It is necessary and right. The function of an organ is the work it has to do; it is what it was made for. Thus, while morphology is best understood by studying first and most profoundly the lowest and simplest forms, and thence tracing, step by step, the process of complication by differentiation and specialization as we go up; physiology, on the contrary, is best understood by studying first and most profoundly the highest forms, and then going down the scale. In the lowest forms, all the functions are mingled and combined in every part, and therefore imperfectly declared. As we go up the scale, functions are separated and localized, each in its own organ, and therefore proportionately perfected, and their purpose plainly declared.

Thus, then, while in teaching morphology, the best order is admittedly to begin with the lowest organisms and go upward, following the order of evolution, yet in teaching physiology, — as I have always maintained, but contrary to the custom of most biologists, — the best order is just the reverse, that is, to begin with the highest form, man, and go down the scale, showing the modifications and simplifications, and especially the merging of functions successively into one another until all distinction is lost. In the lowest forms, functions cannot be understood except by knowledge previously gained higher up the scale. Function, like purpose, can only be clearly understood in its fully declared form. That this is not generally admitted arises from the fact that in these latter days, under the influence of a materialistic evolution, morphology has completely overshadowed physiology. This cannot continue. The reaction has already commenced.

So also there are two corresponding points of view from which we may regard evolution, namely, evolution as a formal process, and evolution as a teleological process, that is, a process having an end, a goal, a purpose, — in a word, a function, — in the scheme of nature, a function in the cosmic organism. From the one point of view, the best order of study is the order of history; from the other point of view, the only order is the reverse. From the one point of view, we must carry forward the laws, the factors, the processes which we find in the evolution of animals, and apply them fearlessly to

man. From the other point of view, we first find what seems the purpose and significance of the whole process in man, and then try to find the beginnings, the foreshadowings, of these in animals, in plants, and even in inorganic nature.

This point has been rightly insisted on by our author. Darwin says, and rightly, "What explains animals must explain man also." Watson retorts, and rightly, "Whatever fails to explain the phenomena of human life, for example, natural selection acting alone, must also fail to explain fully the phenomena of animal life." The only mistake the author makes here is identifying natural selection with evolution. Again, Darwin says, and rightly, "Intelligence and reason are no new things in man, for we easily see the beginnings of these in the higher animals also." Watson retorts, "If so, then neither are they any new things in the higher animals, but in less and less perfect form, which we no longer call by these names, they are present in lower animals and plants also, and in inchoate condition immanent even in inorganic nature itself."

Now this, as all must recognize, is exactly the contention of all my writings on this subject. The immanent Divine energy which in its generalized, diffused, unindividualized condition we call the general forces of nature, individuates itself more and more through all geological time by a process of evolution until it reaches complete individuation as a separated, but not independent, a free, but not unconditioned, part of the Divine energy in man. The effluence from the Divine Person which informs nature and determines all its phenomena, after long embryonic development in the womb of nature, 1st, as physical force, 2d, as vital force in plants, 3d, as conscious force in animals, finally comes to birth, 4th, as the self-conscious spirit of man. Man thus becomes, not a creature only as other things, but also a child of God, an image not only in the sense that a work is the image of the worker, but also in the sense that a child is the image of his father. He is not only made, he is begotten of God. He becomes thus a partaker of the Divine nature, therefore immortal.

Is it not evident, then, that by simply extending the meaning of evolution, Professor Watson's line of reasoning leads inevitably to my conclusion? The unity of nature cannot be broken, even for man. He fully recognizes this, but he also

adds, "The Darwinian evolution — that is, natural selection — cannot explain the unity of nature, because it breaks down at man." True, it breaks down at man, but not because man is separated from nature, but because it breaks down everywhere, though in different degrees, all along the line of evolution. The failure has been growing all along the line, but becomes conspicuous only at the end. In a word, Darwinian evolution, not only in the narrower sense of some modern biologists and of the author, as limited to natural selection, but also in the broader sense of Darwin himself, as including all the factors of organic evolution, fails to some extent to explain even organic evolution itself, much more to explain human evolution. Moreover, it is its conspicuous failure to explain the phenomena of human evolution that brings into strong relief its partial failure all along the line of evolution, but more and more as we rise in the scale. Evidently, it fails for want of some idea left out. It is clear, then, that what we want is not a repudiation of evolution as applied to man, but a broader and more philosophic view of evolution as the Divine process of creation of all things, including man.

I have said that Darwinian evolution fails more and more as we rise in the scale, for want of something left out of account. We see what this is by observing the cause of its conspicuous failure when it comes to man. This is evidently that it leaves out of account the coöperative factor so conspicuous there. Applying now the retroactive principle spoken of above, there must be some similar factor left out also below man. That factor is coöperation in some sense. As self-consciousness is the underlying condition of the free, voluntary coöperation with nature in the work of his own evolution so characteristic of man, so consciousness is the underlying condition of the voluntary purposive activity of animals in the operation of the factors, use of organs, and sexual selection, so characteristic of animals as contrasted with plants. The purposive voluntary activity of animals becomes higher and higher, and its agency in evolution becomes greater and greater, as we approach man, although it never reaches a conscious, voluntary coöperation in the process of evolution itself. Animals coöperate with nature to attain immediate ends, and thus unconsciously coöperate to carry forward evolution; but they cannot perceive, much less coöperate to bring about, the end of evolution, because

they have not attained the formation of abstract ideas, much less the formation and pursuit of ideals. Thus there is also a gradual evolution of coöperative activity as of all else. In plants, even, there is self-activity and therefore coöperation, the unconscious with physical nature in evolution. In animals, coöperation becomes conscious, but directed only to immediate ends. In man it becomes free, self-conscious coöperation in the work of evolution itself.

Thus reasoning from matter upward by the methods of science alone, at first all seems necessity and mechanical automatism, without intelligent design or purpose; and since nature is one, the same must be true of man also. Thus we reach, seemingly logically, the universal-automatism philosophy of some modern thinkers. But, contrarily, reasoning from self-consciousness downward, and assuming again the unity of nature, we equally logically arrive at a universal immanency of consciousness and will. But this again equally destroys our individual freedom by absorbing it in the universal consciousness and will. Now, these two mutually excluding philosophies are completely reconciled in my view of immanent Divine energy gradually individuated through all time to completeness in man.

Or, to put it in another way: In the history of philosophic thought, (1) Man is first entirely separated from nature by an impassable gap, and is alone free. (2) Then the unity of nature is recognized and becomes indeed a condition of rational thought; but the scientific study of nature, having commenced from below, led to the conception of an automatic cosmos in which there is no room for freedom, even for man. (3) Then thought, returning to the human point of view, rejects mechanical automatism, but now finds unity only in a pantheism, which again destroys individual freedom by swallowing it up in the all-including Divine activity. (4) Finally, in my view, unity in nature is preserved, and freedom restored, by the gradual evolution of freedom out of apparent necessity until it becomes complete in man.

IV. Application.

Let us now apply these principles in answer to the specific objections of the author.

Professor Watson says Darwinism cannot explain human

freedom. Surely not; but evolution, as I understand it, can and does. For, by my view, there has been a gradual evolution of freedom from the beginning. All grades of freedom are found in the course of evolution. (1) First of all there seems to be only physical and mechanical necessity. But even there necessity is only seeming, for free Divine activity underlies all. Freedom is immanent and potential. (2) Then energy assumes the form of life in plants, — self-activity individuating itself, — and therefore begins to be separately embodied or free. (3) Then energy becomes conscious life in animals, self-directing, but only to immediate ends under the guidance of impulse. Surely we have here a higher form of separate individual freedom. (4) Then it becomes self-conscious and self-directing to a distant end — to an ideal. This is what we call the free will, or moral freedom, of man. Now at last the separateness is completed, but not yet the freedom. The highest is not yet attained; it is not yet freedom in the highest sense. The ideal may be only limited and selfish. The self-active spirit may still chafe against the bounds set about it by the laws of nature, which are the laws of God. (5) Finally, in the last stage, the ideal man, activity is no longer conditioned by self, but directed toward the absolute, the Divine ideal. There is now complete recognition of the law of the whole humanity and of the whole cosmos as the law of reason and the law of perfect righteousness. The individual will now moves freely and without friction, because in perfect harmony with the perfect will of God.

I put it in still another way, as the gradual evolution of the individual will. I have said that the free will of man, coöperating with nature in the work of his own evolution, is more than a mere factor coördinate with other factors. It is naught else than that which in a more imperfect form underlies and determines all evolution. Will, or purpose, is indeed the unknown factor, without which evolution may possibly be scientifically though not philosophically intelligible. It underlay and determined evolution from the very beginning. (1) First it is immanent in nature in generalized form as physical and chemical forces. It is not yet individuated as will. (2) Then it becomes visibly purposive in the individuating life forces of plants. We still do not call it will, although it is certainly self-active and purposive. (3) Then it becomes conscious in animals, and for the first time we call it will. (4) Then it

becomes the self-conscious free will of man. But even yet not wholly free until, (5) and finally, it freely and lovingly accepts the all-embracing and all-righteous will of God as the law of its own activity. Throughout the whole process the determining cause is the Divine will, but a portion separates itself more and more to complete freedom in man. Yes, complete freedom, but only in order to be again progressively united with the Divine will through the higher law of love, and now without loss of freedom, because love is the perfect law of freedom.

Again, Professor Watson says, "Natural selection cannot explain knowledge." Surely not; but evolution, as I understand it, can and does. For, again, there has been a gradual evolution of the capacity for knowledge also; though it does not attain real knowledge, as we know it, until man. There is, indeed, a great change along the whole line of capacities right here with the origin of man, as I have already shown in another paper.[1] Right here, consciousness becomes self-consciousness, animal will becomes free will, animal affection becomes human love, and sense-perception becomes knowledge. But in all these respects organic evolution brings the animal soul to the very door of humanity, to the very birth of the free spirit.

Nowhere is this clearer than in the matter of knowledge. For what is the essential and necessary condition of knowledge? It is the conception of relations abstracted from things. Animals perceive things only; man, in addition, perceives also the relation of things to one another. Or, if we insist upon calling these relations things also, then are they intellectual, not material, things. To put it otherwise: animals have percepts only; man, in addition, creates concepts also. Now, knowledge is founded on concepts only. It is evident, then, that knowledge is impossible to animals. Animals are brought very near, as it were, to the door of knowledge. They certainly have a practical awareness of the relations of things to one another and to themselves, for how else could they adjust themselves to external conditions? They have, I repeat, a practical awareness of relations; but not as relations abstracted from the things related and considered separately. But all knowledge comes of this latter alone.

[1] *Monist*, April, 1895.

Let me illustrate: (1) Take number. Animals perceive a number of things, — one thing, two things, three things, etc.; but they have no conception of number abstracted from the things. Now, the whole science of number — for example, arithmetic and algebra — comes wholly out of this latter. (2) Again, take space. Animals perceive space as occupied by objects, but they have no conception of space abstracted from the objects contained. But all science of space — that is, geometry — comes out of this latter. (3) So again, time. Animals perceive time as containing events, but they have no conception of time abstracted from those events. Now the whole science of time — that is, history, even the history of self — is based on this latter alone. Thus the animal kingdom in its highest parts was brought by organic evolution to the very door of knowledge, but man alone entered and carried evolution upward to a higher plane.

Finally, Professor Watson says, "Natural selection cannot explain morality." Surely not; but evolution, as I understand it, can and does. For there has been also a gradual progressive evolution in the basis of morality, namely, love. Surely animal affection, especially in the form of motherly affection, is brought very near to human love; and out of human love has grown the love of the ideal, that is, the love of God. Add love to freedom and knowledge, and have we not the bases of morality and religion?

In one word, I would say (and doubtless Professor Watson would agree with me) that natural selection cannot explain that which is the underlying condition of all these, namely, self-consciousness. Surely not; but evolution, as I understand it, can and does, that is, teleological evolution operating by many other factors in addition to natural selection. According to my view, this is the very meaning and purpose of organic evolution. I have said that the formation of abstract ideas is the distinctive characteristic of man. Now, the discovery of self, of the Ego, is an abstraction from the facts of consciousness. It is the most complex and yet the most fundamental of all abstractions. It is the abstraction which gives meaning and reality to all other abstractions, and therefore the basis of all that is most characteristic of man. The discovery of the Ego is indeed the discovery of the world of reality as contrasted with the world of appearance, the noumenal as contrasted with the phenomenal; the world of spirit as contrasted with the world of matter.

WOMEN IN GUTTER JOURNALISM.

By HARYOT HOLT CAHOON.

IN the world of modern wild-cat journalism the woman reporter lasts about four years. She brings her education, her personal attractions, her youth, her illusions, her energy, her ambition, and her enthusiasm to the encounter, and the first year she rises rapidly. The second and third years she enjoys the zenith of her popularity; with the fourth year she begins the descent, lingers about the horizon for a time, and then she disappears from view.

There is no vocation into which women have entered where disillusions materialize so rapidly as they do in journalism. The stage is looked upon with horror by conservative people whose knowledge of it is based entirely upon prejudice; but in comparing the career of the actress with that of the newspaper woman, I have no hesitation in asserting that the experiences of the actress who attains success through love of her art and devotion to it are infinitely preferable to those of the successful woman who finds her field in the modern newspaper. The path of the woman between whom and the public is the glare of the footlights is paved with fewer stumbling-blocks than that of the woman who seeks public applause through a pen in modern journalism. She knows more of personal comfort, she meets with fewer temptations, and she has a better opportunity for cherishing the illusions with which she started in life.

In the sensational newspaper a woman with a love of adventure finds her taste gratified. It is the young woman always who is the prey of the sensational press. We all like to believe that the young have of sentiment a goodly share, and I have seen them come with a whole cargo of it into the newspaper office. The woman who is trapped into a career is generally an out-of-town woman. She usually comes from the West or from the South. She has had some little experience in the office of a village paper or county weekly, and as she knows how to write local society matter, her townsmen have told her she has talent. She has written poetry and a few essays that have been applauded by her friends, and once one

of them found its way into a great metropolitan Sunday paper. That settled it. She at once determined to try her skill in the field of journalism in New York.

I can see her now as she is ushered into the editor's presence, with her little card of introduction from some well-meaning friend who wants to help her to get a foothold. She is fresh and fair, and her eyes are bright with hope and credulity. Her attire is not of the city type, but it becomes her in spite of that. Nothing could mar her youth, and there is just a shade of anxiety and eagerness, and a brave attempt to overcome shyness, for her heart beats very loudly. The sensation editor is always looking out for new people — new women — who are new in the sense that they have courage, enthusiasm, and talent. If the newcomer has "gumption," if she is clever, if she can see where she looks, in the fact that she is a newcomer lies her chief advantage. She is impressionable; everything interests her because she sees everything.

Here, then, the editor recognizes a possibility. Only youth and enthusiasm and a love of adventure combined would be equal to the task he has in mind. But he breaks her in gently. For a week or two he gives her trifling assignments, to see what she can do with her pen. It is not really the pen that the sensational journalist wants. He wants untried courage that is looking for a trial. He wants force and determination combined with personal attractions. The last is needed always, and in a certain trusting naïveté and fearlessness that is part and parcel of the out-of-town maiden he recognizes her stock in trade. The pen part of the work is a secondary consideration.

So he writes her out a list of questions, and sends her to interview a prize-fighter. Does this individual know a pretty woman when he sees her? Certainly, and her very innocence makes her fearless and adds to her charm. The prize-fighter is an easy assignment; she puts forth her best energies, and her interview is a charming one, and appears over her signature. This speedy flight to the pinnacle of fame is far beyond her wildest and most ambitious imaginings. The result intoxicates her; the whole office is talking about her; and the men ask for an introduction. They shake hands with her and congratulate her; already she is a co-worker. They had no idea there was so much in the little country girl.

One of the fellows invites her to dinner; but she is shy and she is afraid to go.

After that she has a police-court assignment. The police court is brutal, and she winces some under what she hears there; but she must not wince. She reasons it all out to herself, and she places herself in the background, because she belongs to journalism now, and every virtue and every emotion must be subservient to that one of filling her assignment and procuring the news for her editor. She must not be thin-skinned if she wishes to succeed in her chosen vocation, especially as the editor thinks she is qualified. So few women are qualified, she tells herself, and so few women have the opportunity. She must not forget to be grateful; she learned appreciation at home. So she steels herself, and mantles her womanhood with the mud-stained garment of modern gutter journalism.

Then she must do the slums; she cannot consider herself educated for a career until she has seen the filth of slum life, and investigated the opium den, Chinese vice, the brothel, and every other mysterious place in a great city that always stands ready to gratify morbid curiosity. But hers is professional curiosity. She must know about everything, or she can never expect to be a successful journalist. One day she attires herself as a Salvation Army soldier, and marches with the Salvation Army through sections of the city in which they are expecting rocks to be cast at them. Then she writes about it, and has pictures made illustrating the sensation, and then she signs her name to her effort. Fame now seems quite within her grasp.

After that she does some missionary work, and presents herself in the capacity of a teacher in the Chinese Sunday-school. She teaches there six consecutive Sundays before a Chinaman makes love to her. She has to have him make love to her, or else she would not get the story. But she makes a pretty good Sunday-school teacher; she used to teach in the Sunday-school at home, and even that attainment serves her now that she has become a journalist. Little she thought how all that good home training of years was simply fitting her for grand achievements in the future. She had a great story about the goings-on in that Chinese Sunday-school; it filled seven columns, and it had a number of pictures illustrating the situation, and her name printed in

display type. All New York was talking about the great exposé; she had never dreamed of fame like that. It hardly seemed true, but it must be so; for everybody congratulated her, and she went to dinner that night with another woman and two men, so that she could enter more graphically into the details of her experience. She is a regular heroine now, — a thoroughbred. Through her the newspaper poses as a great moral reformer.

Next, she follows up an old woman whose son has committed a crime. As the old woman is in a charity hospital, she must go herself to the charity hospital; and in order to get in there she must pose as a sufferer from an incurable disease. The physicians examine her, she explains to them about her imaginary symptoms, and they believe her. She plays a difficult part, — acts every minute of the time; and when a reporter comes to see her in the guise of her brother, she gives him such bits of news about the miserable old woman as she has been able to glean, and he, setting his imagination to work, gets up a fairly good story. But she remains in the charity hospital until she is enabled to gain an audience with the poor old creature, when she recovers very suddenly, and takes unceremonious leave. She has a magnificent story this time, with her name signed to it, and fame actually staring her in the face. She was paid $10 a day for her work, and the newspaper had a big "beat." She sold what is rarely offered at $10 per day: her word, her honor, and her self-respect. She sold them pretty cheap.

Her taste for adventure is by this time well whetted, and she subsists on the stimulant of a self-exaltation of the most spurious kind. But she has plunged into the work, and her thoughts are busy with the task of the day. She has no time for retrospection, nor for introspection. Ambition lashes her heels, and she labors under the misapprehension that she is working at legitimate journalism.

Next, I see her going the rounds of all the charitable institutions; she wears a shawl over her head, carries a basket on her arm, and leads a little child — a borrowed child — to lend credence to the situation. She is desirous of finding a home for herself and her child. She tramps all day, and then she writes a story about the charitable institutions of New York City. She illustrates the article with pictures of herself in the attitude of a mendicant and an impostor, while she proves the

fact that in none of the institutions, to the back doors of which she applied for admission, could a woman and her child be sheltered. Under office orders she carefully avoided the institutions in which she could have found shelter. They were not along the lines of what she was desirous of proving, and the next Sunday, in a page article, she sets forth her adventures, with a harangue against the organized charity of the city. Again the newspaper poses as a great moral reformer and detective of injustice. Fame fairly grasps her by the hand this time.

Whatever work her editor lays out for her, that she stands ready to do, whether it is figuring in a balloon ascension or a fire-escape descent, posing as an artist's model, camping all night on a millionaire's grave, trotting round the globe in eighty days, or, in short, doing any of the things that are beneath the notice of any man on the staff, or, to put it more mildly, "outside of a man's province."

But for some time she has been enjoying the zenith of her newspaper glory. Her name is featured about town on posters and bill-boards, and she creates an enormous sale for the newspaper. Attrition with the world in which she has lived has removed from her the bloom and delicacy of the womanhood with which the Creator endowed her, and a blunting of her moral sensibilities has — what has it not done? — what that is undesirable has it left undone? If she stops to think, she must be appalled that she finds herself no longer in possession of the characteristics which she possessed at the opening of her career, and which, through a love of adventure, a lack of restraint, and misguided ideas of her duty, she has surrendered. Nor are these incidents in her life, as a victim of gutter journalism, all there is to tell.

Years ago a degenerate public was nourished by a newspaper story of a young woman who called upon the various prominent physicians of New York, representing to them that she wished to lend herself to a criminal operation at their hands. As the tangible fruits of her canvass, she gathered an interesting collection of prescriptions. Then she published, together with the prices she paid for each prescription, the name of each physician and the interview. After this tragedy, in which she played the leading part, it sounds little to say that during the Parkhurst raid on the Tenderloin she appeared to its leader and his gentle wife in the guise of a homeless

fallen woman who desired to be sheltered from the keen blasts of the winter season, during which, you will remember, the raid occurred. That story was tame, because it was honest.

But her usefulness as a tool of gutter journalism is waning. For the want of a better idea possibly, she is sent out upon the streets at night, in the hope that men will insult her. She stands at the door of theatres in order that men may accost her, and then, in both instances, she proposes to write articles showing up the depravity of the male sex. I have it from her own lips that she was not molested in either capacity as a vice detective. Nevertheless, she wrote her story just the same, painting in valentine hues from the paint-pots of her distorted imagination. The editor expected it to fill a few columns, more or less, and she must not disappoint him.

Disregard for the truth has by this time crowded out the results of her early training. The great public, personal and general, friend and foe alike, are but subject-matter for her pen. She knows how to intrude herself into the family circle, through letters of introduction, her tact and intelligence winning the way for her, and then, during a kindly interview on an impersonal subject, she leads the conversation along personal lines, and the article published in the paper she represents proves to her innocent victims that their visitor was merely a wolf in sheep's clothing. But they are armed for the future against all women of the press; she has burned the bridges behind her.

Where now is the hopeful, credulous, enthusiastic, ambitious girl who came to the city about four years before, or less? Ill health from exposure, self-neglect, late hours, and weariness stimulated to strength has begun to plough inroads into her system. Ambition begins to wane; the fire of enthusiasm burns low; there are no more worlds to conquer, and she could not conquer them if she would. As she has no more ideas to offer her newspaper, it has no further use for her; and her place is soon filled by others who offer themselves a willing sacrifice upon the altar of sensational journalism. Now at last she has time to reflect in bitterness, and to behold herself in a true light. She has lost all the capital she had when she began, — youth, health, credulity, her ideals, her self-respect, her enthusiasm, and her ambition. Disillusionized of every sacred ideal of her heart, having given all, and with nothing left but ill health and experience, no longer with any

wares to offer, she realizes that what she took to be fame was only vulgar notoriety, and that it was unworthy of her. It is an unpleasant picture, but it is a true one.

Then, too, she has not had a very good time. She has learned to adapt herself to the society of vulgar men who have no standard of purity for either men or women, and she has had the benefit of a view from their standpoint. She almost sees through their eyes, and, if such a thing were possible, her ideas would become as perverted as theirs. There was a time when she thought that her path led toward an editorial chair; but she sees her mistake now. As well may a pettifogging lawyer expect to sit in a chair of the Supreme Court of the United States.

In presenting these facts, my idea is not to tear down, but to build up. It is to make a plea to the gentle apostles of the pen in journalism that they will hold themselves from becoming burnt-offerings upon an altar where the sacrifice avails nothing. It should be the woman first, and the newspaper second. The individuality that holds the pen should be a woman's individuality that is above price. The newspapers need women. They need a woman's pen; she has proved that. They need a woman's eyes with which to see, and they need a woman's sentiment with which to clothe the rude realities of life. In prostituting her talent the crime she commits is a double one. Principle, not environment, is the guardian of our talents. It is not the editor that is to blame. It is the woman who becomes the tool, the agent, who is the guilty one. When time at last proves her a failure, she has only herself to thank.

There is legitimate work upon a newspaper for a woman to do, — work that requires no surrender of feminine dignity and self-respect. The world of conscientious, womanly newspaper-workers have suffered keenly from the stigma placed upon them by the worker who has no particular standard by which to reckon the principles that govern action.

It is in view of this fact that I maintain that the woman who sacrifices herself upon the altar of gutter journalism, who makes herself valuable to a newspaper by relinquishing her individuality and her womanhood, who sells her honor for a column of newspaper matter, because it is expected of her, is the greatest stain upon the escutcheon of intelligent womanhood that exists to-day.

BRAINS FOR THE YOUNG.

THE DESIRABILITY AND THE FEASIBILITY OF THE ACQUISITION OF SOME REAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE BRAIN BY PRE-COLLEGIATE SCHOLARS

By PROF. BURT GREEN WILDER,
Of Cornell University.

I BEG the reader's attention to the title, and particularly to the sub-title, of this article. The title is "Brains *for* the Young," and the sub-title sets forth in guarded language the thesis in its entirety, the desirability and the feasibility of the acquisition of some real knowledge of the brain by pre-collegiate scholars. Never before has there been such general and such keen interest in the study of the structure and functions of the brain. In attempting to determine the affinities of various animals to one another, the brain is more and more regarded. When I was a student, bones almost exclusively were thought of. Skeletons were supposed to be the guide to the affinities of structure, and a large part of the three years that I spent on the study of human anatomy between 1859 and 1862 — a too large part of that period — was spent in the study of bones, and I have had a very decided reaction from that early state of mind.

The number, the extent, and the significance of the resemblances and peculiarities of the human brain constitute some of the most difficult morphological problems. Compare the appearance presented by the human head cut in two in the middle, and that of the head of a chimpanzee which has been prepared in the same manner. Then compare the brain of a child at birth, as seen from the side, with the brain of a young chimpanzee. Upon comparison of these two aspects of the divided brains, the resemblances are seen to be very much more numerous and significant than the differences. Indeed, the differences are insignificant; the resemblances are startling. Nobody has yet succeeded in defining what it is that constitutes the human brain, as different from the brain of any other animal. We may recognize it. Any skilled anatomist would recognize the human from the animal brain, but that is a very different thing from formulating the differences, and

that is what we aim at. It is one of the objects for the remainder of my life, to be able to say in words what it is that differentiates our brain from the brain of other animals. The development or embryology of any brain presents a series of marvels. Unless the reader has seen a representation of the series of stages through which the brain of a child comes into the adult condition, he will have to take upon faith my statement that what is most prominent in the embryo brain is the region which is completely obscured in the adult human brain. What does this mean? I don't know; nobody knows. I only state that this is one of the thousand extraordinary things which meet us in this study.

With regard to the difficulty of formulating the differences between the brain of the human and the animal, it is a consolation to be able to say that in the course of the development of the human brain there is manifested a condition which has never yet been observed in the brain of any other animal. At a later stage than the embryonic, each of the cerebral hemispheres presents a wrinkled or corrugated outline. Still later that wrinkling disappears, and permanent corrugations and depressions and ridges come into existence. Now, in no other creature whatsoever has there ever been observed in the developing brain the wrinkled condition which we see at a certain stage in the human brain. But take not too much flattering unction to your souls, for nobody has ever seen an embryo chimpanzee or a gorilla at a corresponding age; and it is one of the desires of the anthropologists and biologists of to-day to be able to determine from actual inspection whether there is in apes at this period a condition which some expect and rather hope to find, but which others would be very much dismayed to discover.

If a chart of the brain be examined, the observer will see certain compressed lines. These constitute a certain pattern, which is recognizably different in every brain. We are as yet unable to correlate the pattern of the fissures with race, sex, character, or education. In these later years has arisen what may be called a scientific phrenology, founded upon a partially observed and collated result of experiment, disease, and accident. Disabilities are now often relieved by surgical operations on the brain that a few years ago would not have been attempted. Some of the greatest advances of microscopic methods have had for their main object the elucidation of

nervous difficulties. The effects of fatigue and over-stimulation upon the nerve cells have been actually demonstrated under the microscope.

Special periodicals devoted to psychology are published in all civilized lands, including our own. Even newspapers print articles, lengthy and illustrated, but not always reliable, and sometimes giving very wrong impressions, though trustworthy as witnesses to the extent of the interest in the subject at the present time. But, after all, how many outside of the little band of neurologic experts can comprehend what is said of the brain. Among the most frequently reiterated assertions are, first, that the human brain is absolutely larger than the brain of any other animal, and second, that it is relatively larger. But it is a well known fact that, relatively, or in ratio of the weight of the brain to the weight of the entire body, man is surpassed by a large number of birds, and by most of the smaller monkeys. Many monkeys, indeed, have brains twice as large in proportion to the body as our own. Man's superiority does not depend upon either the absolute weight of his brain or the relative weight. Is it not even true that schoolboys may describe the rivers of Africa, and yet be but little acquainted with their own brain? And, except in unusual cases, is not the real knowledge of the brain gained only in colleges and medical schools, and the alphabet then learned at a period when its use should be second nature? Does not that humbug, phrenology, waste the time of thousands of inquiring, but half-educated, persons, who might be saved such folly by a little real knowledge of the anatomy of the brain? How may these incongruities be eliminated? How may these various needs be met? How may the practical difficulties be overcome?

Let us summarize the conditions; let us recognize clearly where we are. First, the human brain is probably the most complicated organ in nature. Second, of parts or features of the human brain visible to the naked eye, there have been already described at least five hundred. And for those five hundred there have been coined and are on record at least ten thousand five hundred different names in various languages. Third, to understand, to teach, and to investigate concerning the brain, involve the prompt recognition of these many parts and the ready recollection of their names. Fourth, such recognition and recollection imply an

exercise of the memory which becomes less attractive and more difficult every year of our lives. Fifth, it is commonly assumed that the knowledge of the human brain must be gained directly from that organ or from diagrams and models.

Among the branches of knowledge which the liberal, educated man should possess, President Gilman names as first, "the knowledge of his own physical nature, especially of his thinking apparatus, by which his intellectual life is carried forward." Professor Goodwin, of Harvard, is reported to have declared that whatever branch of knowledge is to be most successfully pursued should have its foundation laid in the scholar's mind before the age of fifteen. The painter Hamilton has said this, which deserves to be inscribed in every library and public school: "Personal familiarity alone makes knowledge." And to Joseph Henry, the revered head of the Smithsonian Institution, we are indebted for this: "In the order of nature, doing comes before thinking, art before science." We have turned this upside down. An ancient Latin proverb reminds us that "carpenters don't learn their trade upon rosewood, nor tailors upon cloth of gold."

Granting, then, the desirability of a general knowledge of the human brain, I propose a natural, rational, and logical, although perhaps novel, system of education in the subject, beginning with the lowest grades of schools, and adapted to the mental and emotional status of the pupil. These gradations can be demonstrated to be natural stages of progress in study, whether they be applied to the individual at various periods of life, or whether they simply be applied to the same individual at a given period.

At the beginning, we have stage A, adapted to the primary schools. The student should be encouraged to observe. It was Agassiz, I believe, who half humorously said that he hoped "to be remembered as having trained at least one observer." The primary pupil should be taught to use his eyes and his hands. Later, it may be desirable to teach that the laying on of hands is unwise; but at the beginning I am convinced that the child sucks in information through its finger-tips, and that it should have the specimen that it is to study in its hands as well as before its eyes. He should be given the specimen, and encouraged to find out things for himself. The child should be compelled (and compulsion

may be exerted so that it will not be felt to be such) to draw — to represent what he sees by lines upon paper. It makes no difference whether the parents feel that "artists are born, not made." Art in the high sense is not here in question. What I claim is, that any child which has eyes and hands can represent what it sees by means of lines upon paper; and I insist, furthermore, that that kind of exercise should be called for from the child before it is taught to write. Drawing is natural, writing is horribly artificial. The child should be taught to dance before it is taught to walk. The natural things should be developed first, the artificial afterwards. It does not make any difference at first whether good pictures are made or not. Let them be repeated and faults pointed out. No instrument need be used. What I recommend is, that, say, an actual sheep's brain should be put into the hands of the child. If the child has seen upon its parents' table some preparation of a calf's brain, it will perhaps be prepared to admit that the sheep's brain is not a very dreadful object after all. The impression that natural-history specimens are disagreeable is an altogether secondary one with most children. The natural instinct of curiosity in a child prompts it to reach out for specimens, and to examine them.

After the child has observed, and the teacher can find nothing upon the surface which the child has not already observed, and shown by his drawings, the teacher should put into the hands of the child a knife, and under the teacher's supervision there should be made a cross section of the frontal region of the brain, another section further back, and a third section that shall pass through the insignificant region, which is identical with the sheep's brain. These sections will show in the first place that the brain is not a solid mass. They will expose cavities; and the child's interest will be aroused as much almost as if it saw a tunnel and a pair of caves into which it might creep bodily. The child will desire to know if those cavities have any connection with one another, and the teacher has simply to suggest that the child put the specimen under water and with a little tube blow into the single hole behind, when the child will see that bubbles will come out from the two cavities in front, and it will then infer that the cavities are continuous. These sections will also expose the fact that the brain is homogeneous in the matter of color, and that the colors are to be recognized, and their distribution indicated,

by drawings. In connection with this there should be pictures of the corresponding sections of the human brain, so that they can be readily compared.

We come now to stage B, of the grammar school. Here comes the second stage, that of not merely observation, but comparison; and into the hands of the pupil should be put the entire brain of the sheep as before, likewise the brain of a cat or dog, and he should be required to draw and draw again the brains of all these from corresponding positions. Certain parts of the brain of the cat will require the use of a lens. The child will find certain fibrous cords on the face of the brain; and a picture should be provided to enable him to recognize that those cords are nervous cords, and that some of them connect with the eye, and that other nerves go to various parts. All these things should be compared, with the sheep as basis and the cat or dog as the second term of comparison. Finally, on the brain, especially of the cat, there may be recognized the peculiar arrangement of the fissures. These are so complex in the human brain that they are very hard to study, and so hard in the sheep that it is idle to try to study them. In the cat's brain there is a feature which has never been explained. There is a certain fissure which is nearly a straight line, there is another in front, and a third behind. Now, in the brains of all the wild dog kind there is an arch over that straight line. In a cat, the two pillars of the arch never meet. In my laboratory, thousands of cats' brains have been examined, and every one of them has been scrutinized with this point in view, and never once has there been seen a meeting of those two lines to form a complete arch. The child who happens to discover that those two fissures do meet in the cat which he has under his observation, may at least lay claim to a distinction which has not been attained before. The relations between the various regions of the cerebrum and certain functions of the body should also be pointed out, especially the region which, in man as well as in the cat, seems to be connected with the power of moving the tongue.

Stage C, in the high school. Here for the first time it seems worth while to introduce ideas, generalizations, comparisons, of such a character as to compel the pupil to think. For this purpose I would advise that, while retaining the brain of the sheep, the cat, and the dog, comparison should be made

with the brain of the turtle, that is, the great sea-turtle which is used for soup. Its brain is commonly thrown away. The close resemblance between the structure of the brain of the turtle and the human brain will impress the pupil. After noting that certain portions of the brain are gray and certain portions white, he should examine these under the microscope.

In stage D, which may represent the condition of the pupil in a college or university or medical school, the comparison which has already been made between pictures of the human brain and the actual brain of the sheep, etc., should be extended to other animals. In that way the universality of the idea of similarity of structure will be demonstrated to his mind. Then the human brain itself, that precious material, may be put in his hands. In the high school there should be at least a well preserved human brain, which may be seen or held in the hands, but it would not be practical to provide such to be dissected. But in the college it should be dissected and pored over. Even after the many years during which I have been studying the brain, I may say I never make a cut in the human brain that I do not see something new, or at least get some new views. Finally, in the latter part of a university course or a medical course, the student may be intrusted to pursue original research.

Let us without prejudice contemplate the objections to the proposed course of study.

First, may be the aversion of the pupil. I have already said, however, that this aversion is originally something that is inculcated, and that a child is, as a rule, rather too eager than too averse from handling anatomical specimens. At Cornell last fall, the class in Physiology numbered one hundred and eighty, of whom at least one-fourth were women; and only two of the whole number had to be excused from the class. One was apparently a genuine case of hysteria, and on the application of the young woman's parents and physician she was excused. The other was a young lady from Boston who had conscientious scruples. I promptly gave her something to do from books, and I did not worry her or allow her to worry me. Practically, there is not the least difficulty due to the aversion of the pupil for the objects presented.

Secondly, so far as the brain is concerned, there is an ob-

stacle which is altogether imaginary. People say, if the human brain, — and practically the same is the case with the brain of a cat or a dog, — if the human brain contains five hundred different parts, what an enormously complicated task it must be to study it. Let not this, however, paralyze us at the outset, nor let it induce us to regard the pupil as likely to be paralyzed. As a matter of fact, the brain, although the most complicated, the most difficult, of the viscera, is at the outset at once the most acceptable and the easiest to deal with. The heart not only lies on one side, but it is twisted in all sorts of ways. The liver and other organs are unsymmetrical. The child seeks for something that corresponds with his own eyes and his own body. The brain is less disagreeable than any other organ; and a fresh brain, with its lovely pure white and its delicate pinkish gray, lying upon the top of the skull, is vastly prettier than an oyster on the half-shell, which most children learn to look upon without repugnance. I insist upon it that we have here an altogether imaginary objection.

Thirdly, it must be admitted that many teachers have not had sufficient training to enable them to follow these directions. In that case, however, they need only do the prescribed things for themselves, and so keep ahead of their pupils. The teacher need practically to keep only one grade in advance of his pupils.

Fourth, the large number of technical terms involved in describing the structure of the brain constitutes a certain barrier to its study. Efforts are being made, however, to simplify this nomenclature.

I come now to a point which I doubt not has oppressed some of my readers. Something has to be killed in order that its brain may be studied. The proposal here made is that the study of the brain should begin with the brain of a sheep; and civilized man has not come yet to the point where he allows sheep to die a natural death. Their heads may be had for five cents. Cats and dogs must be killed. They are not in the market. Let us face the issue. No one is fonder of cats than I am; and yet in a single class of mine about two hundred are dissected each year, and I am responsible for the death of between four and five hundred cats every year of my life. I do not know whether I may look forward to encountering those cats in after life; but I would much

rather encounter them than some people I have known; for I should expect that these animals would utter a prolonged hymn of praise to me for having put them out of their misery. They were cats of the kind which are a disgrace to every city and town in the United States except New York, which has a special provision for gathering them in and killing them, and Ithaca, where we use a great many every year for dissecting purposes. I carry in my pocket a little bottle of chloroform, and no wretched, miserable, starving cat escapes me. Our cats are brought in from the neighborhood, and if people miss their pets they are allowed to come into the university and look through the grating and to pick out any cat there, if they will only guarantee to take care of it.

As to obtaining human material, the case is more or less complex. The brains of criminals of various types can be obtained without much trouble. But there has been too much study of the brains of criminals. It is well that the brains available for examinations in the higher schools, etc., should not be the abnormal brains of criminals, lunatics, or paupers. On the contrary, we should endeavor to obtain the brains of people of respectability, good birth, and education. At present I have in my collection the brains of eight more or less well-known, distinguished, moral, and educated persons, and these have been photographed and otherwise utilized with the utmost care and circumspection.

The plan outlined here is, I believe, sound in its conception and practical in its carrying out. If it be put into operation, then I venture to prophecy that, of the hundred pupils who may first learn about the brain by means of that graded system of education, *all* will thereby be made better citizens and better parents; *twenty* will become better teachers, more successful practitioners of the law or medicine, or more potent ministers of the gospel; and *one* at least will become an investigator and discoverer, increasing knowledge for the glory of his country and the enlightenment of the world.

AGNODICE.[1]

By SELINA SEIXAS SOLOMONS.

LONG ages since, when plunged in thickest night
Of ignorance and error lay the world,
Save where, in one small spot called Greece, there blazed
The noonday sun of learning and of art
Destined to shed its beams unto all time,
In the Athenian tribunal hall,
Summoned for judgment, stood Agnodice.

A form of noble majesty and strength,
Such as the genius of that ancient clime
Has left in priceless legacy of stone,
Outrivalling in stately, calm repose
The sculptured column at whose side it stood;
Serene those features, cast in mould superb,
Yet fine-cut as a carven cameo.
A mouth whose generous curves bespoke a soul
Large, brave, yet tender; prone to sympathy.
Eyes like a crystal pool, yet in their depths
Lurked, baffling idle gaze, dark mysteries,
All fathomless as is the deep green sea.

Then spake the Justice: "You are summoned here,
A charge most grave to meet; for it is claimed

[1] AGNODICE. — The name of the earliest midwife mentioned among the Greeks. She was a native of Athens, where it was forbidden by law for a woman or a slave to study medicine. According to Hyginus, however, it would appear that Agnodice disguised herself in men's clothes, and so contrived to attend the lectures of Hierophilus, devoting herself chiefly to the study of midwifery and the diseases of women. Afterwards, when she began practice, being very successful in these branches of the profession, she excited the jealousy of several of the other practitioners, by whom she was summoned before the Areopagus and accused of corrupting the morals of her patients. Upon her refuting the charge by making known her sex, she was immediately accused of having violated the existing law, which second danger she escaped through the intervention of the wives of the chief persons of Athens, whom she had attended, who came forward in her behalf and succeeded at last in getting the obnoxious law abolished. — Smith's "Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology."

The noble art of medicine you 've used
To cover other base, designing arts
Against the peace of the domestic hearth,
Corrupting Athens' maids and matrons pure;
That, feigning ailments of the flesh to heal,
That which tenfold more precious is, the health
Of the immortal soul, you undermined.
Here in the court do your accusers stand,
Athenian citizens of high repute,
Prepared to prove conclusively their charge.
A stranger, Athens gave you learning, fame.
How ill do you requite her if this crime
Be fastened on you, which by Grecian law
Must be atoned by death! Now, prisoner,
The Court of Athens will permit your plea."

The form beside the column raised its head,
Down-bent the while the Judge's speech was made,
And in a voice whose full, rich, swelling tones
Were like unto an organ's, came these words:

"O righteous judge, and all assembled court,
I face you with the truth upon my lips.
As to the grievous crime upon me charged
A strange dilemma I 'm compelled to meet.
I do avow the practice of deceit
O my Athenian fellow-citizens.
But that I have seduced their wives and maids
Is foully false, a piece of calumny
Which in three simple words I can refute;
Yet these of fell import, for Athens counts
As infamy th' offence I thus avow,
No less than that wherewith I am wrongly charged:
In either case my life the forfeit pays.
Should I keep silence I might win release,
For of my guilt there can be brought no proof;
Yet foul, unmerited dishonor's stain
On Athens' blameless matrons there would rest.
I cannot purchase life at such a price.
Know then, O citizens, that I who stand
Before you, charged with this vile crime, am but
A woman, and my name Agnodice."

Throughout the court, at this confession strange,
Arose a tumult that not soon was quelled,
While motionless and calm its object stood,
As though the matter nothing her concerned.

"I marvel not that ye should stand amazed
To hear the revelation of my sex.
Well have I kept my secret, since not one
Of the wise men of Athens did suspect
That underneath the learned doctor's garb
There beat a mere weak, craven woman's heart.
And now that I am doomed I pray the Court
For leniency, while I do relate
The story of my life, to warn rash youth
Of Athens, lest they follow in my course."

Consent was granted, and Agnodice
Continued her recital: "As a child
I saw my brothers at their games and books,
Wherein they told me I could have no part,
Because, forsooth, I was a woman-child!
That to my sex forever was denied
The boon of knowledge, for the gods ordained
That woman by her nature was but fit
For household tasks and bearing of the young.
I answered naught, but in my heart was born
Faint stirrings of rebellion 'gainst my fate.
I mused — 'How strange that these same mighty gods
Have placed such aspirations in my breast
That do of right belong to men alone!'
And so apace this knowledge-hunger grew
Until it gnawed into my very soul.
And when at length I could no longer brook
The torment, did I make a rash resolve
To brave the wrath alike of gods and men,
Attain the wisdom I so coveted
At any cost. I left my native heath,
And, well disguised in masculine array,
Journeyed to Athens, where I boldly knocked
Upon her doors of learning; the result
You know full well. For I bore off the palm
From all my masculine competitors,

Although I was a woman. Strange, indeed,
If woman's brain is by the gods decreed
Of poorer quality than is your own,
That I should outstrip all the noble youth
Of Athens! Mark you then, if this my act
Had been displeasing to th' eternal gods,
As in the eyes of men, would they have shown
Such favor to the maid, Agnodice?
Would they have placed these laurels on my brow?

"Such wrong the mighty gods could never do —
Endow a woman with the attributes
That to the sex superior belong,
And then deny her opportunity
To exercise these faculties divine.
And so I reasoned, 't was a blunder made,
For which the gods were not responsible.
Dame Nature 't was who in erratic mood
Had linked a man's mind to a woman's form.
And none suspected, none in all these years,
The secret of my sex. Oh, strange indeed,
The ways of gods are — not like those of men —
That by mere change of garb a woman is
Transformed into the semblance of a man,
And that great inner difference concealed!

"The gods were good; they granted me success.
My fame spread far and wide, and from all parts
Came the afflicted, seeking for relief.
But of all patients did my heart the most
Incline unto my suffering womenkind.
For I too was a woman, and my heart
Went out to these, my sisters, in their woe.
For they have trials that ye reck not of,
O men of Athens, following the path
Of glory, wealth, and honor in the world,
Unmindful of the dull and thankless lot
That falls to them, your mothers and your wives,
Makers and moulders of the race, that bear
The burdens of yourselves and of your sins
Before birth, and until your dying hour.

"So to the mothers and the wives of Athens
I gave my services and sympathy.
I sorrowed in their sorrow, and rejoiced
When they were glad. In pity for their pain
I wrought appliances for their relief;
Devices crude which science may some day
Perfect, forgetting that the hand and brain
That first did fashion them were those but of
A simple woman, called Agnodice.

"Yea, I confess I loved them, and from them
Won love and gratitude. And such as these
Are the base arts ye charge that I have used,
O men of Athens, whom your vices make
Prone to suspicion, these the dealings foul
That I have had with your chaste wives and maids.
Such are the soundless depths of infamy
To which have sunk these slandered Grecian dames.

"Ah, now, accusers, does the flush of shame
Not tinge your brows to hear the simple truth?

"O men of Athens, if ye could but know
What finer forces dwell within the frames
Of your submissive, gentle womenkind!
These are your warriors, doing battle brave
With armed hosts of sin and suffering!
With smiles that hide the heartbreak giving up
The sons they 've borne to fight their country's foes.
Mightier than battles fought in blood to win
A kingdom, and more glorious victories
These conflicts of the soul from which there come
Patience, obedience, and self-sacrifice!
These are your statesmen, teaching to your sons —
The little lads that cluster round their knees —
The love of Greece and reverence for her law;
These are your sages, who in silence learn
Lessons of wisdom taught not in your schools —
A truer wisdom of the heart and soul,
The flower of their life's experience!

"What do ye with them? Shut them up to spin?

"O men of Athens, hearken to my plea!
Do as you will with me, but give to them
A larger freedom, standing at your side,
As equals, and no longer slaves and toys!
Give all their faculties development;
No longer bind their souls in iron bands
Of custom, forged from superstition's flame.
Then from a fairer Greece shall spring a race
Greater and nobler than ye yet have seen.

"I would not be so impious to say
The gods have erred. Ye have not read aright,
O men of Greece, their mystical decrees.
Lo! here I make to you a prophecy:
If in your blindness ye shall still ignore,
And your descendants, this mysterious force,
This potent agency — the feminine —
In the affairs of life, 't will not be lost.
Naught in the universe is ever lost!
But, beaten back upon itself, pent-up,
Mute, motionless, and stifled in the breasts
Of womankind, a hundred thousand fold
'T will multiply until, long ages hence,
Bursting asunder its fast prison bars,
In one tremendous, irresistible
Outflow of power, 't will o'erwhelm the world,
Triumphs achieve that man has never dreamed!

"Thus then will the eternal righteous law
Be vindicated; so the mighty gods
Avenge the fatal ignorance of man!

"My tale is done. Do with me as ye will!"

She ceased, and silence for an instant fell
Upon the multitude. Then through the court
Was heard a murmurous undertone that swelled
In volume, rising ever like the tide,
Until a very ocean it became
Of sound tempestuous, upon whose wave,
Above the mighty roar, these words came borne:

"Well hath she done and spoken. Set her free!
Let all revere the brave Agnodice!"

THE UNKNOWN: PREVISION OF THE FUTURE.[1]

By CAMILLE FLAMMARION.

THIRTY-ONE years ago, in 1865, I published a small brochure which every one has forgotten, and which, indeed, is now unobtainable, entitled, "The Unknown Forces of Nature." It dealt with the subject of the psychic forces, which, since then, have begun to make their way in the world. From that epoch, already distant, these questions have continued to occupy my thoughts at the rare intervals of leisure which serious and entrancing astronomical researches have permitted me. This subject, so complex, of the psychic forces, is truly one of the most interesting and important in the world, for it touches us all very nearly. Then, again, the unknown, the mysterious — does it not excite the interest of all inquiring minds? Where is the human being who has not inherited from our charming mother Eve something of the venial sin of primitive curiosity, to which, moreover, humanity owes all its progress?

It is, then, an excursion into the domain of the unknown, especially into the subject of the prevision of the future, that I propose to make, along with those among my readers who believe, as I do, that "we do not know everything."

At one time I had for a friend an estimable savant, remarkably strong in mathematics, who was director of the Paris observatory from 1869 to 1872 — Charles Delaunay. It had been foretold to him that he would perish by drowning, a fate which had overtaken his father; and not only would he never undertake a sea voyage, but he even avoided the most harmless boating parties. On a beautiful day in August, 1872, however, his father-in-law, M. Millaud, postmaster-general, carried him off to Cherbourg, and with a couple of sailors they went off to visit the breakwater. On returning from their excursion, which had passed off very pleasantly, the wind rose and began to blow with the greatest violence, and

[1] Written for THE ARENA; and translated from the French by Frederick T. Jones.

the pinnace capsized with its four passengers, not one of whom was saved.

In such an occurrence some persons may see a mere coincidence. From the standpoint of the question of the prevision of the future, a solitary fact of this kind is not, by itself, of much weight. A man is afraid of the water; he is drowned. Another dreads hydrophobia; he is bitten: another has a presentiment against journeys; he is the victim of a railway accident. Such coincidences attract notice, but they prove nothing.

This, indeed, ought to be our mode of reasoning, if examples of that kind were isolated. But they are not. They are more numerous, and the circumstances are more precise, than will accord with the doctrine of probabilities. Here is another fact, related by Madame Leconte de Lisle, sister-in-law of the poet:

> One M. X. [I am not partial to anonymous examples, but I take the story as it is reported] consulted a card-reader, who predicted that he would die from the sting of a serpent.
>
> This M. X., who was a government employé, always declined a position in Martinique, on account of the venomous serpents there. M. B., minister of the interior at Guadeloupe, induced him to accept a good position under him in that colony, which is free from serpents.
>
> Having completed his term at Guadeloupe, M. X. set out for France. As usual, the vessel put in at Martinique, where he was careful not to disembark. Some negresses came on board to sell fruit. Being thirsty, the voyager took hold of an orange in a basket, but immediately uttered a cry. He had been stung by a serpent hidden under the leaves. In a few hours he was dead.

This story was published quite recently in the *Annales des Sciences Psychiques*. Here is another case, not less strange, of clairvoyance of the future.

One day in October, 1883, Lady A———, living in rue du Bel-Respiro, Paris, found that she had been robbed of a sum of 3,500 francs. She notified the commissary of police on rue Berryer, who instituted a search and questioned the servants, but discovered nothing. Lady A———, when enumerating her servants, begged the commissary to exclude from his suspicions her second *valet de chambre*, a youth of nineteen, very good-looking, very respectful, and very well qualified for his duties, who had been nicknamed "*le Petit*," not

on account of his stature, for he was rather tall, but from a feeling of delicate, protecting familiarity which his good qualities had won for him.

Meanwhile, among the friends of Lady A——— there had been a good deal of talk about a certain Demoiselle E———, who, they said, could see the most surprising things in a bowl of coffee grounds. M. L. d'Ervieux had the curiosity to accompany his governess to the house of this person, and was quite surprised to hear her describe exactly each piece of furniture in Lady A———'s apartment, pass in review her seven servants, and say that, though she could not name the thief, he would be guillotined within two years.

Some weeks later "*le Petit*" left the service of his mistress without giving any reason, and two years later he mounted the scaffold. This servant, so highly esteemed, was none other than Marchandon, the assassin.

Listen to one more story.

M. T. Thoulet, professor in the faculty of science at Nancy, was, in his youth, at Piedmont, as the assistant and friend of M. F———, an old naval officer, who was engaged in the work of reopening an ancient sulphur mine. They slept in adjoining rooms, separated by an open door. Madame F———, who was living in Toulon, was nearly at the end of that condition which is called "interesting," and M. F——— had spoken of the matter to his young friend, though without insistence or uneasiness. It was a second child, and everything was progressing most favorably.

One beautiful night, however, towards morning, M. Thoulet sprang out of his bed, ran to that of his neighbor, woke him, and read to him a despatch announcing the birth of a little daughter. He had read but three lines of it, out of six, when the despatch seemed to leave his hand, as though some one were taking it away, all wide open as it was. M. F——— got up, dragged his friend into the dining-room, and made him write down what he had just read; then, looking at their by no means correct costumes, they suddenly burst out laughing, and went back to bed.

Ten days later the despatch arrived, composed similarly of six lines, whereof the first three were precisely those which M. Thoulet had seen in his hallucination.

How can one see in advance something which does not as yet exist? "That is the question."

Goethe, in his "Memoirs," tells of a strange vision which terrified him as he was leaving a village where he had taken farewell of Frederick:

I saw, not with my bodily eyes, but with those of the spirit, a horseman who was journeying toward Sesenheim along the same path. The horseman was myself; I was dressed in a gray coat, edged with gold lace, such as I had never worn. I roused myself in order to drive away the hallucination, and I saw nothing more. Eight years later I found myself on the same road, revisiting Frederick, and clothed in that identical dress. I must add that it was not by any intention of my own, but solely by chance, that I had donned the costume.

Let us again ask the same question: Can one, then, see in advance something which does not as yet exist? The idea has been suggested that at times, in a fugitive moment, we appear to be sensible that we have already, at some previous epoch, found ourselves in circumstances identical in all respects with those in which we actually find ourselves. This is a species of momentary hallucination. But this explanation is a mere hypothesis, and one, moreover, which is inapplicable to the facts already cited.

In studying this question, the important thing, above all others, is to collect precise and well authenticated facts. A single fact, well observed, is worth more than a thousand theories.

Here is yet another, reported by M. Groussard, curé of Sainte Radegonde.

While at Niort, boarding, being then nineteen, he dreamed that he was at Saint-Maixent, a city of which he knew only the name, along with the keeper of his pension, in a square in front of a pharmacy, with a well at the side, and that a lady, whom he recognized as having seen once, came toward the keeper of the pension and talked with him about an affair of some importance. Some days later the keeper of the pension, to whom he had told his dream, having to go to Saint-Maixent, took him along. What was his astonishment to again find the square, the pharmacy, and the well, and in due course to witness the arrival of the lady in question, whose conversation was precisely that which he had already heard in his dream!

I have at hand a great number of similar experiences, with

which, however, I will not weary the attention of the reader, but the interest of which seems to me remarkable from the point of view of the question under discussion. I will cite just one more, the hero of which I am very well acquainted with. It concerns itself with one of my confrères and friends at my entrance into journalism, Émile de la Bédallière, editor of the *Siècle*. The circumstances of his marriage are extremely curious. A lovely young girl, living at La Charité on the Loire, was sought in marriage by three aspirants, and her parents desired to ascertain what her own feelings were on the subject. She had a dream about marriage, and there passed before her eyes a young man in a travelling suit, his head covered with a large straw hat, and wearing spectacles. An inward voice told her that this would be her husband. The next day she assured her parents that she would not marry any one of the three claimants.

In the following August, young Émile de la Bédallière accompanied on a vacation one of his friends, who went to La Charité, stayed with him in that city, and accompanied him to a subscription ball. He wore his travelling costume, a manila straw hat, and spectacles. It was the first time he had visited that district. The young girl recognized the fiancé of her dream, and a few months later the wedding took place.

As I write these lines, a friend comes in who, in his turn, relates to me the following occurrence: This friend, M. Jules Flandrin, formerly lived in Marseilles. It was in March, 1869, and work was being done on the construction of a bridge across a street. One night Madame Flandrin awoke, completely terrified by a dream. She had seen the bridge fall in, and she recounted the details of the accident. They then went to sleep again. "At seven o'clock in the morning, when we were getting up," said the narrator to me, "we learned with stupefaction that the bridge had fallen in at six o'clock."

It would be easy to multiply such illustrations, which do not date from yesterday, seeing that the wife of Julius Cæsar begged him not to go to the senate on the day on which he was assassinated by Brutus, but that he laughed at her dream.

The fatalistic Arabian maxim says: "It was written." The Book of Destiny is at the basis of all ancient beliefs. The scientific and rational observation of certain psychic phenomena leads to the same doctrine.

But, then, if the future *is*, if it cannot but be what it will be, what becomes of our consciousness of free will and responsibility? It may be replied that the human will is a real cause, which operates in the making of the future. Doubtless: but in coming to our determinations, do we not decide in favor of the preponderant motive?

Here is yet another mystery.

DESPAIR.[1]

BY ELEANOR FORD.

NOT rest eterne: unending growth!
Thus teach the prophets of to-day.
To labor on my soul is loath;
Give me Nirvana, God, I pray.

The days are over-filled with woe,
The nights, black milestones on my way.
Oh! when this soul to Thee must go,
Grant it Nirvana, God, I pray.

In weal, I loved this life of mine:
Its future, whether grave or gay,
I never thought thus to resign:
Now for Nirvana, God, I pray.

I ask not this sad self to keep
In conscious life in that Great Day:
Engulf it in the essence deep
Of sweet Nirvana, God, I pray.

[1] The object of the writer of these few stanzas is to suggest the natural effect of engrafting the Oriental faith on Western thought and experience.

CONCERNING A NATIONAL UNIVERSITY.

By EX-GOV. JOHN W. HOYT, LL.D.,
Chairman of National University Committees.

THE proposition that a great nation like ours should have at least one university will certainly pass unchallenged. Even in countries half enlightened there is a vague appreciation of the value of learning, and some readiness to make sacrifices to secure its benefits to their people; while in some of those more advanced in civilization there have been heroic and protracted struggles for those higher institutions which are everywhere recognized as essential means of providing for the culture of such as look to service in the higher fields of activity, — institutions which early came to be known by the high title of university, and which have so multiplied, especially in the United States, that to the uninformed there appears no present need of another, of whatever rank.

But there are universities and universities. For this present purpose this term is used in its highest sense only, that of a true university, — what Dr. B. A. Gould understood to be "the *universitas litterarum*, the Πανεπιστήμιον, an institution where all the sciences in the complete and rounded extent of their complex whole are cultivated and taught, where every specialty may find its votaries, and may offer all the facilities required by its neophytes," whose "aim is not so much to make scholars, as to develop scholarship, not so much to teach the passive learner, as to educate investigators, and not merely to educate, but to spur on."

It is perhaps needless to say that the nearest approaches to this ideal are to be found at Berlin, Paris, and Vienna; at all of which great centres there has been such concentration of means and forces during recent years as finds no precedent. Millions upon millions are being there invested right along in the construction of needed buildings, in the equipment of libraries, museums, and laboratories, and in the employment of the foremost of specialists in every department of science and learning. Somehow the wisest of their men have found their way into the national legislatures, and the enthusiasm of the highest has come to pervade even the

lowest ranks of the people. All these institutions have long rested upon the colleges and gymnasia, and are now in each case so correlated with the public schools of every grade as with them to form a national system. They are already a mighty inspiring and uplifting influence, educational, social, industrial, and political. Thousands of their own graduates throng their halls and laboratories, and thousands more of ambitious young men from other lands are annually availing themselves of such facilities there furnished as they do not find at home.

And what of the United States? is the inquiry made by ambitious and discomfited Americans. Is it implied that with Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Princeton, and those great new institutions, State and independent, of which we hear so much on every hand, — that with all these, some of them endowed with many millions, we have no university in this country? To this we answer, It is not implied merely, but plainly asserted, that as yet there is not one true university in America. There are colleges with university titles in great and steadily increasing number, some of them doing a noble collegiate work and some measure of university work; but names are of themselves nothing. They are often, as in this connection, misleading and even preventive of the highest good.

There is nothing like starting right in the inauguration of great enterprises. They who long for the coming of a true university, and who have determined to work for it until its realization, have in view no fragmentary, mixed, or competitive institution, of which there are so many, but rather a university in the highest sense, — an institution greater and more complete than even the foremost of Europe; so that, instead of annually sending three thousand college graduates to them for the completion of their education, five thousand of their graduates shall come to the University of the United States.

President David Starr Jordan has concisely said, "A university consists of investigators teaching. . . . It should be the place for the training of investigators." And again:

> Its function lies not in the conduct of examinations or the granting of academic degrees. . . . It should have the same relation to Harvard and Columbia and Johns Hopkins that Berlin University

now holds. It should fill with noble adequacy the place which the graduate departments of our universities but partially occupy, because their teachers have carried on original work, if at all, in hours stolen from their daily tasks of plodding and prodding. In doing so it would furnish a stimulus that would strengthen all like work throughout the land.

Pointing out the characteristics of a university more fully, when this great, central, supplementary institution comes, it will be above and beyond all that we now have; supplying what they cannot furnish, and bringing the schools, colleges, and so-called universities into harmonious relations with one another, with an incalculable saving of means and forces everywhere. As elsewhere said, it will be an institution

Where the love of all knowledge, and of knowledge as knowledge, shall be fostered and developed; where all departments of learning shall be equally honored, and the relations of each to every other shall be understood and taught; where the students devoted to each and all branches of learning, whether science, language, literature, or philosophy, or to any combinations of these constituting the numerous professional courses of instruction, shall intermingle and enjoy friendly intercourse as peers of the same realm; where the professors, chosen, as in France and Germany, after trial, from among the ablest and best scholars of the world, possessed of absolute freedom of conscience and of speech, and honored and rewarded more nearly in proportion to merit, shall be, not teachers of the known merely, but also earnest se ırchers after the unknown, and capable, by their genius, enthusiasm, and moral power, of infusing their own lofty ambition into the minds of all who may wait upon their instruction; a university not barely complying with the demands of the age, but one that shall create, develop, and satisfy new and unheard-of demands and aspirations; that shall have power to fashion and mould the age unto its own grander ideal; and which, through every change and every real advance of the world, shall still be at the front, driving back from their fastnesses the powers of darkness, opening up new continents of truth to the grand army of progress, and so leading the nation forward, and helping to elevate the whole human race. Such an institution would be to the world its first realization of the true idea of a university.[1]

[1] Report on Education (in connection with the Paris Universal Exposition of 1867), by John W. Hoyt, United States Commissioner, p. 398.

Such a university of the United States, planted at the national capital, in view of the means and forces already there, and of the priceless benefits it would in many ways confer upon the Government itself, and upon the whole people, is strongly demanded. The security of our free institutions demands it. The proper development of our resources, material and intellectual, demands it. The honor of the American name and of all Anglo-Saxondom demands it. Our solemn duty to the future of the human race demands it.

Then why is not such a university a living fact to-day? Surely this great nation, rich in material resources, rapidly growing in accumulated wealth, and richer still in the intellectual resources of a gifted people, is strong enough to build it. Indeed, we have almost a university at Washington already. Behold the great array of departments, bureaus, and other organized agencies doing already in part the work the university would do, were they duly correlated and wisely directed:

In the Treasury Department of the United States:
The Office of the Coast and Geodetic Survey,
The Office of the Life-Saving Service,
The Marine Hospital Service,
The Bureau of Statistics,
The Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

In the War Department:
The several military bureaus.

In the Navy Department:
The Naval Observatory,
The Office of the Nautical Almanac,
The Hydrographic Office,
The Bureau of Navigation,
The Bureau of Yards and Docks,
The Bureau of Ordnance,
The Bureau of Construction and Repair,
The Bureau of Steam Engineering,
The Museum of Hygiene,
The Bureau of Medicine and Surgery,
The Dispensary.

In the Department of the Interior:
The Patent Office,
The Bureau of Education,

The Office of the Geological Survey,
The Census Office.

In the Department of Agriculture:

The Botanical Division, with the gardens and grounds,
The Division of Vegetable Pathology,
The Pomological Division,
The Microscopical Division,
The Chemical Division,
The Ornithological Division,
The Forestry Division,
The Entomological Division,
The Silk Section,
The Experimental Stations,
The Office of Statistics,
The Bureau of Animal Industry,
The Weather Bureau,
The Agricultural Museum.

Of establishments not under Departmental control:

The Bureau of American Republics,
The Smithsonian Institution,
The National Museum, with its twenty-two departments,
The Medical Museum,
The Medical Library,
The Bureau of Ethnology,
The Light-House Board,
The Commission of Fish and Fisheries,
The Arsenal,
The Congressional Library,
The United States Botanic Garden,
The Zoölogical Garden (in preparation),
The Government Printing Office,
The Soldiers' Home,
Office of the National Board of Health,
Government Hospital for the Insane,
The National Deaf-Mute College,
Courts, District, Circuit, and Supreme.

Of local institutions and establishments:

The Columbian University, with its professional department of law and department of medicine,
The Howard University, with its like departments,
The Georgetown University, with its departments,
The "National University" law school and school of medicine,
The Corcoran Art Gallery,

The Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Dumb,
The Columbia Hospital for Women,
The Children's Hospital,
The Providence Hospital.

Of learned associations of men:

The Philosophical Society of Washington,
The Anthropological Society,
The Biological Society,
The Chemical Society,
The Botanical Society,
The National Geographical Society,

To all of which might be added, since their annual meetings are held at Washington, the National Academy of Sciences, and the American Historical Society.

In view of all the considerations involved, and of this virtual beginning in the way of material foundation, it is incomprehensible that the Congress of the United States, supposed to represent the wisdom of the nation, should not have been moved to establish the National University long ago.

From year to year Americans celebrate the matchless virtues and achievements of him who was "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen," while yet they fail utterly to do anything toward the realization of that for which he labored, and prayed, and sacrificed as for nothing else save the freedom of the Colonies and the founding of the Republic.

Great, indeed, were the wisdom, patriotism, generalship, and statesmanship of the immortal Washington. Hardly less remarkable, in view of the conditions of his life, were his estimates of the priceless value of learning as a means of promoting the security and general welfare of the new American republic; the profound interest he manifested in adequate provision for the intellectual culture of the whole people; the prescience with which he anticipated the demand for a crowning central institution to be established and fostered by the Federal Government; the deep solicitude and self-sacrificing devotion with which, even from the midst of the Revolutionary War to the end of life, he persisted in efforts for a national university.

Surprising, also, is the fact, so full of reproach for succeeding generations, that this great idea of Washington, so steadily

fostered for a quarter of a century, has not even yet been realized. Is it not fitting, then, that on the day set apart as sacred to his memory, we revive the recollection of—

His many efforts even before the actual founding of the Government.

His inaugural address, January 8, 1790.

His letter of November 27, 1794, to John Adams, Vice-President.

His letter of December 15, 1794, to Mr. Randolph, Secretary of State.

His letter to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

His letter to Thomas Jefferson, March 15, 1795.

His letter to Governor Brooke, of Virginia, March 16, 1795.

His two letters to Alexander Hamilton, September 1 and September 6, 1796.

His letter to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, designating a site.

His last message to Congress.

His dying bequest, leaving as a beginning of a pecuniary foundation a sum which, had it been cared for by the Government, in accordance with the stipulations of his last will and testament, would by this time have amounted to nearly five millions of dollars.

No wonder that one hears on all sides the questions, "Why this great neglect?" "Have there been no other champions of a cause so important, and now become sacred?"

Aye, champions indeed! Illustrious champions, and in great numbers, as you shall see.

Deeply sharing Washington's patriotic aspirations, James Madison, Charles C. Pickering, Benjamin Franklin, William Samuel Johnson, and other distinguished members of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 sought to incorporate a provision for the proposed National University in the Constitution itself, and only yielded to the general judgment that the exclusive authority of Congress over the District of Columbia, already provided for, obviated the necessity for any specific provision, and to the desire of all that nothing superfluous should have place in that great instrument.

There, too, was Dr. Benjamin Rush, signer of the Declaration of Independence, and leading scientist of his time, who in the very year of the Convention made eloquent pleas such as this :

Your Government cannot be executed; it is too expensive for a republic; it is contrary to the habits of the people, say the enemies

of the Constitution of the United States. However opposite to the opinions and wishes of a majority of the citizens of the United States these declarations and predictions may be, they will certainly come to pass, unless the people are prepared for our new form of government by an education adapted to the new and peculiar situation of our country. To effect this great and necessary work let one of the first acts of the new Congress be to establish within the district to be allotted for them, a Federal university, into which the youth of the United States shall be received *after they have finished their studies and taken degrees in the colleges of their respective States.*

There, also, in the same year was the distinguished Samuel Blodget, author of the first American work on economic science, who, at the very beginning of a lifelong support of the proposition, briefly said:

> If a Federal university should be established . . . it must be simple, complete, and grand. . . . It must also be central, and under the patronage of the Federal power.

After these there followed a long line of advocates, beginning with the commissioners appointed under the "Act to establish the temporary and permanent seat of the Government of the United States," whose memorial to Congress on December 12, 1796, is especially worthy of attention, since, after referring to the setting apart of lands for a university site by Washington, and his having actually paid five thousand pounds sterling as a contribution toward the pecuniary foundation, the commissioners add the following:

> They do not think it necessary to dilate on a subject in respect to which there seems to be but one voice. . . . We flatter ourselves it is only necessary to bring it within the view of the Federal legislature. We think you will eagerly seize the occasion to extend to it your patronage, to give birth to an institution which may perpetuate and endear your names to the latest posterity.

Then followed, in succeeding years: The friendly words of President John Adams in his inaugural address of March 4, 1797. The memorials of the resolute Samuel Blodget, especially the one of 1805, according to the Annals of Congress "representing that subscriptions toward a university at Washington have already been made to the number of eighteen thousand, and a sum received amounting to $30,000."

The efforts of Thomas Jefferson on many occasions, especially in his sixth annual message of December 2, 1806, in which, after offering abundant reasons in support of Washington's views, he added:

> The present consideration of a national establishment for education, particularly, is rendered proper by this circumstance also, that if Congress, approving the proposition, shall yet think it more eligible to found it on a donation of lands, they have it now in their power to endow it with those which will be among the earliest to produce the necessary income. This foundation would have the advantage of being independent in war, which may suspend other improvements by requiring for its own purposes the resources destined for them.

The like earnest support of President James Madison in —

(1) His second message, of December 5, 1810, showing that "such an institution . . . would be universal in its beneficial effects;"

(2) His seventh annual message, of December 15, 1815, in which he said: "Such an institution deserves the patronage of Congress as a memorial of that solicitude for the advancement of knowledge without which the blessings of liberty cannot be fully enjoyed or long preserved;"

(3) His last annual message, of December 3, 1816, wherein again he forcibly urged "the establishment of a national university within the District on a scale and for objects worthy of the American nation."

The efforts of President James Monroe, in coöperation with others, for the development of the Columbian Institute, in the hope of its becoming eventually the desired national university.

The eloquent appeals in this behalf by President John Quincy Adams in both messages and speeches, especially in his first message (1825), so sound in its reasoning, so pathetic in its allusions to Washington, and so full of deserved reproach for his fellow-countrymen:

> So convinced of this [the need of a national university] was the first of my predecessors in this office, now first in the memory, as he was first in the hearts of his countrymen, that once and again, in his addresses to the Congresses with whom he coöperated in the public service, he earnestly recommended the establishment of seminaries of learning, to prepare for all the emergencies of peace and war, a

national university, and a military academy. With respect to the latter, had he lived to the present day, in turning his eyes to the institution at West Point he would have enjoyed the gratification of his most earnest wishes. But in surveying the city which has been honored with his name he would have seen the spot of earth which he had destined and bequeathed to the use and benefit of his country as the site for a university still bare and barren.

The subsequent efforts of earnest men both in and out of Congress, among them such men as the eloquent President Holley, of Kentucky, and the learned Judge William Cranch, until the coming of Andrew Jackson, who so gladly approved of further Congressional aid in the form of $25,000 cash to Columbian College, in 1832, on account of the acknowledged "utility of a central literary establishment," and of the failure thus far to make any more direct recognition of the repeated recommendations of his predecessors.

Thenceforward for a period of forty years there was silence on the part of the presidents and of Congress. The several executives had become disheartened by the inability of the national legislature to rise to a comprehension of the needs of American education. Not so its friends among the people, for these four decades of comparative darkness were studded with starry names, like those of —

President Thomas Hill, of Harvard,
Professor Benjamin Peirce, of Cambridge,
Professor Louis Agassiz, of Cambridge,
Dr. James Apthorp Gould, astronomer,
Professor John F. Norton, of Yale,
Professor James Hall, geologist, of New York,
Professor Amos Dean, of Albany,
Bishop Alonzo Potter, of New York,
President James McCosh, of Princeton,
Professor Arnold Guyot, of Princeton,
Professor Joseph Henry, of the Smithsonian Institution,
Professor O. M. Mitchell, Director of the Cincinnati Observatory,
Dr. Alexander Dallas Bache, Superintendent of the Coast Survey,
and so on.

But all these were the individual appeals of illustrious men. There was need of organization. And so in 1869, on motion of Dr. John W. Hoyt, of Wisconsin, the National Educational Association espoused the cause and formed a

great committee for its furtherance. Three successive annual reports, in which were set forth the need of a central university of highest rank and the principles which should govern in its organization, were unanimously approved by the Association, and a bill was finally prepared in counsel with Senators Sumner, Patterson, Howe, and others, and introduced in both Houses of Congress, and by the House Committee on Education unanimously reported in 1873.

President Ulysses S. Grant, having meanwhile become deeply interested in the cause, gave it his indorsement in characteristic manner, as follows:

> I would suggest to Congress the propriety of promoting the establishment in this District of an institution of learning or university of the highest class, by donation of lands. There is no place better suited for such an institution than the national capital. There is no other place in which every citizen is so directly interested.

Unfortunately, for reasons known to those directly interested, the National Educational Association, having fulfilled the service of reënforcing the old demand, and of indicating the scope and outline of the proposed university, did not systematically persist in its efforts with Congress for a considerable time thereafter.

But the advocacy of the proposition went forward under the individual lead of strong men in all sections of the country — such men as —

Senator Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts,
Senator Timothy O. Howe, of Wisconsin,
Senator J. W. Patterson, of New Hampshire,
Senator Carl Schurz, of Wisconsin and New York,
General John Eaton, National Commissioner of Education,
Dr. William T. Harris, editor *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* and present National Commissioner of Education,
President Daniel Read, University of Missouri,
President James C. Welling, Columbian University,
Mr. E. L. Godkin, Editor of *The Nation*,
President D. F. Boyd, University of Louisiana,
President Andrew D. White, Cornell University,
President James B. Angell, University of Michigan, and many others.

Meanwhile, came the messages of Rutherford B. Hayes, in 1877 and 1878, arguing the case with a cogency and eloquence unsurpassed, and concluding thus:

The Government cannot now repudiate or reverse its beneficent educational policy. The logic of facts and of reason will not permit it to stop short of the most complete provision for every department of American education. The people are growing in their realization of the necessity there is for insuring the best possible education of the masses. The variety and vastness of the national resources, and the rapid progress of other nations, are making a strong and growing demand upon the industrial arts, which they are powerless to meet without the help of the best technical schools; while the conspicuous place we hold among the great nations of the earth, the nature of our Government, and the genius and aspirations of our people are reasons deep and urgent for a high and thorough culture that must early move the nation to adopt measures that will give to the United States a true university.

Also, in 1885, came the equivalent of a Presidential message in the annual report of Hon. L. Q. C. Lamar, Secretary of the Interior, eloquently insisting that President Jefferson was right when he "told Congress that to complete the circle of democratic policy a national university was a necessity and should at once be created;" that, while "the common-school system . . . constitutes the foundation of our democracy . . . this is not enough to satisfy its instincts;" and that the means of the highest possible culture "will alone realize and express the higher aspirations of American democracy."

Finally, in 1890, there was another beginning of work in Congress by Senator George F. Edmunds's offer of "A Bill to establish the University of the United States," and the creation of a select committee of nine senators to have charge of this interest during that Congress; which committee, having been twice continued, was at length made a standing committee, and has submitted three successive reports, two of them unanimous.

So likewise, in 1891, there was a resumption of organized effort outside of Congress, to-wit:

(1) By action of the Human Freedom League on the occasion of its organization in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, on October 11 of that year, under inspiration of an eloquent paper on "The Nation's Debt of Honor," by Dr. G. Brown Goode, of the Smithsonian Institution.

(2) By the General Committee of Three Hundred of the Pan-Republic Congress, in adopting a set of resolutions offered by John W. Hoyt, on October 13, 1891, and by the

appointment of a committee including one member from each of the States, to promote the enterprise.

(3) By the "Memorial in regard to a National University," by John W. Hoyt, printed in large edition by order of the United States Senate.

(4) By the introduction of National University bills of the aforesaid committee's preparation, in both Houses of Congress, and the securing of reports thereon by the Senate Select Committee.

(5) By the formation, in November, 1895, of a great and independent committee of citizens, to be known as "The National University Committee of One Hundred to promote the establishment of the University of the United States," a committee since grown to be one of over three hundred, including many of our most distinguished scholars, scientists, jurists, and statesmen, the presidents of some one hundred and fifty of our principal universities and colleges, and the State superintendents of public instruction in all the States but one. For greater efficiency, it has an Executive Council composed of the following members:

The Hon. Melville W. Fuller, LL.D., Chief Justice of the United States,

Ex-U. S. Senator George F. Edmunds, LL.D., of Vermont,

Ex-Provost William Pepper, M.D., LL.D., University of Pennsylvania,

Hon. Andrew D. White, LL.D., Ex-President of Cornell University, Ex-U. S. Minister to Russia, etc., New York,

Ex-Governor John Lee Carroll, LL.D., General President Society of Sons of the Revolution, Maryland,

General Horace Porter, LL.D., President-General Society of Sons of the American Revolution, New York,

Ex-U. S. Senator Eppa Hunton, LL.D., Virginia,

Ex-U. S. Senator A. H. Garland, late Attorney-General of the United States, Arkansas,

Ex-U. S. Senator J. B. Henderson, LL.D., Missouri and District of Columbia,

Colonel Wilbur R. Smith, Kentucky University,

General John Eaton, LL.D., Ex-U. S. Commissioner of Education, etc., New Hampshire and the District of Columbia,

Hon. Gardiner G. Hubbard, LL.D., President National Geographic Society, Regent of Smithsonian Institution, etc., District of Columbia,

Dr. Simon Newcomb, LL.D., etc., Director of the Nautical Almanac, District of Columbia,

Hon. John A. Kasson, Ex-U. S. Minister to Austria and Ambassador to Germany, Iowa and the District of Columbia,

Hon. Oscar S. Strauss, ex-U. S. Minister to Turkey, New York,

Ex-Governor John W. Hoyt, M.D., LL.D., Chairman of National University Committees.

(6) By the introduction, in both Houses of Congress, of a new bill prepared by the Executive Council in November, 1895 (all members being present but one).

(7) By the arguments of nearly all members of the Council in support of the bill, before the Senate and House Committees, during the month of January, 1896; which bill has since been favorably reported.

The Senate has not yet taken up and passed any bill, for in each case the reports thereon have been submitted too late to admit of action; but that body has ever shown a friendly and liberal spirit, printing the following documents upon request, some of them in editions of several thousands, copies of which may be obtained on application to John W. Hoyt, Chairman, etc., 4 Iowa Circle, Washington, D. C.

The Bill submitted by Senator Edmunds, in 1890.

The Bill submitted by Senator Proctor, in 1891.

The "Memorial in regard to a National University," by John W. Hoyt, in 1892, containing both a full discussion of the National University proposition, and an exhaustive summary of the notable efforts made in this behalf from before the foundation of the Government.

The Report of the Senate Committee, submitted by Chairman Proctor, in 1893.

The Report of the Senate Committee, submitted by Chairman Hunton, in 1894.

The Speeches in support of the measure, delivered by Senators Hunton of Virginia, Vilas of Wisconsin, and Kyle of South Dakota.

The Bill prepared by the National University Committee of One Hundred.

The Report of the Senate Committee, on the said Bill, submitted by Senator Kyle, in 1896, including the arguments before the Committee by nearly all members of the Executive Council, as well as letters in support of the measure from over three hundred distinguished men in all sections of the country.

"Views of the Minority," submitted by Senator Walthall of Mississippi, in 1896.

"Reply to Views of the Minority," by John W. Hoyt.

The Argument in behalf of the National University proposition, by Professor William H. H. Phillips, of South Dakota, in December, 1896.

The Argument in support of the measure by President David Starr Jordan, of Leland Stanford University, in December, 1896.

The present movement, both in and out of Congress, is based upon the principles laid down and the reasons urged in the reports of the National Educational Association, and in the Senate Memorial of 1892.

In order that the purpose cherished, the principles agreed upon, the considerations which have led to a renewal of effort, and the conditions of success may clearly appear, extracts from an Outline of the Memorial will next be presented.

From the Outline, these passages, to-wit:

I. A great and true University the leading want of American education.

II. The offices of a National University are these:

1. To supplement existing institutions by supplying full courses of post-graduate instruction, and it only, in every department of learning.
2. By its central faculties and cluster of professional schools of highest grade, to represent at all times the sum of human knowledge.
3. To lead in the upbuilding of new professions by its applications of science.
4. To lead the world in the work of research and investigation.

III. Reasons why the Government should establish such a University:

1. Neither existing institutions nor the great denominational universities in prospect can meet the demand. The nation only is equal to the founding of such a university as the nation needs.
2. The Government needs the influence of a National University.
3. The American system of education can only be made complete by the crowning university it lacks, as a source of coördinating influence, inspiration, and elevating power.
4. A National University would powerfully strengthen the patriotic sentiment of the country.

5. A National University would more strongly than any other attract men of genius from every quarter of the world to its professorships and fellowships, thus increasing the cultured intellectual forces of both institution and country.
6. A National University would especially attract students of high character from many lands, whose return after years of contact with free institutions would promote the cause of liberal government everywhere.
7. The founding of a National University would be, therefore, a most fitting thing for a great nation ambitious to lead the world in civilization.

IV. Reasons for founding such University at Washington:

1. Washington was designated by the Father of his Country in his bequest of property in aid of its endowment and by his selection of land for a site.
2. Washington is the only sufficient and convenient spot where the Government has both exclusive and perpetual jurisdiction.
3. There are in the Government departments, and connected therewith, vast amounts of material which could be made auxiliary, and which, being now but partially utilized, are in some part a capital of thirty millions of dollars running to waste.
4. There are hundreds of experts in the departments whose services could be more or less utilized with mutual advantage.
5. Such a university in Washington would exert a great influence upon the National Government itself, in every branch and department.

. . . . . .

VI. Reasons for a renewal of the effort for a National University at this time:

1. The need not only remains, but increases with the years, as shown by the fact that some three thousand American graduates are now seeking opportunities abroad.
2. Since this need can only be met by the nation, why not *begin now?*
3. No other important educational measure is now likely to interfere.
4. A beginning now on the part of the National Government would be certain to attract large donations from private sources for the endowment of fellowships, professorships, faculties, and departments.

5. The growing power of the United States among the nations suggests the corresponding present need of such forces and influences at the seat of Government as shall be worthy to impress and lead the world.

VII. The proposition of to-day is this:

To urge upon Congress the early establishment of a National University of the highest type, and to be known as the University of the United States,

Whose form of constitution shall secure it against partisan control, a thing not difficult, as shown by the success of leading State universities and of scientific institutions controlled by the General Government.

Whose internal management shall be with its educational members.

Whose conditions of admission shall be character and competency.

Whose applicants for degrees already have the bachelor's degree.

Whose fellowships shall be duly endowed and open to the best qualified.

Whose professoriate shall be so constituted as to secure to it the highest possible character and efficiency.

Whose departments of letters, science, and philosophy shall be centres for the grouping of post-graduate professional schools of every class.

Whose beginnings shall be with such means as befit the great undertaking, and shall encourage liberal endowments from other than governmental sources; thus early making it the leading university of the world.

As in part said before, the conditions of success in this movement are these:

First, they who are in power must give the matter its full measure of consideration. Absorbed in other matters, pressed by measures of finance, commerce, lands, industrial development, and much else, even the most intelligent and large-minded of men are in danger of overlooking a measure, however important, comprehensive, and far-reaching, that is neither vital to party success nor boldly insists on being heard.

Secondly, while it may be assumed that such of our statesmen as already appreciate the importance of the enterprise, seeing clearly how it would promote the national welfare and advance the cause of learning in the world, are equal to the

responsibility of taking it up, it is but right as well as desirable that they be duly reënforced by the enlightened sentiment of the country. And they certainly will be.

Educators at the head of our schools, academies, colleges, and universities, with the multitude of their friends, none of whom can fail to see the incalculable value of a crowning institution like the one proposed, will in yet greater numbers join hands for its early realization when they discover an earnest purpose in Congress.

The press of the United States, so liberal and ever on the alert for new measures of progress, has already done much, and can safely be counted on to more fully interest the general public in a proposition so often urged by the Father of his Country, so repeatedly indorsed by other statesmen in all periods of the national history, and so clearly a condition of the highest dignity and welfare of the Republic. Aye, patriotic Americans in general must reënforce the great army already enlisted, unfurling banners not to be furled until the victory is fully won.

Objections have been raised by the heads of a half-dozen ambitious institutions, old, new, and on paper; but they have been answered, and need not be again discussed, unless they should reappear. Such opposition as may manifest itself in any form will disappear on a nearer, more scrutinizing, and broader view.

There has not been named in all the past, nor can there be named in any future, one argument against the National University proposition of George Washington that will bear the scrutiny of philosophy or the test of history.

Let the purpose be unalterably fixed that ere the centennial of his last effort and bequest, the ninth day of July, 1899, the Government of the United States shall have taken the long anticipated decisive step in this great behalf. Let the watchword of Americans everywhere be, The crowning university proposed by George Washington, recommended by the most illustrious of his successors, as well as urged by a long line of other distinguished citizens, and still the crying need of American education — the University of the United States — must be established without further delay. Joining with the distinguished and lamented Gould, of Cambridge and Córdoba, astronomer of two hemispheres, let us say, as with one voice: Found the University. It shall be, first of all, for Americans

and the honor of America, but also for the advancement of knowledge and freedom everywhere. "Found it, and throngs of European youth will also crowd its halls, carrying back with them American ideas to ennoble their own lands, bringing hither with them counterpoises of transatlantic thought that shall ennoble ours, and both by their coming and their going cementing the family of nations in bonds of mutual sympathy and attachment. Found it, though it cost the whole revenues of a capital. Let earth, air, and sea bring their tribute; let California and India pour in their gold, and the busy marts of men their gains, till this great work is done. Thus shall we achieve the glory of a nation, the welfare of a continent, the advancement of the race, and crown the clustering hopes of humanity with more than full fruition."

HON. WILFRID LAURIER,

PREMIER OF CANADA.

WILFRID LAURIER.

A CHARACTER SKETCH.

By J. W. RUSSELL.

TEN months ago, as leader of a numerically small majority in the Dominion House of Commons, Hon. Wilfrid Laurier was the hope of thousands of Canadians who were anxiously awaiting the exit of a moribund régime. To-day, as premier, he has begun an administrative career, during which problems of exceptional stress and urgency are sure to tax his resources as a statesman. He comes upon the scene at a time when Canadian affairs are of larger importance than the merely Canadian outlook would suggest; or, as might be more appropriately stated, when the politics of the Dominion are of unusual concern to the mother country. The tenure of the premiership by a public man of French descent, in a country predominantly English in blood and speech, is a fact of significant interest, and in this instance may almost be termed the solution of a problem. For many years it was necessary to Canadian political harmony that the premiership should be considered a dual office, with its power and responsibility divided between an English and a French representative of the same political party. Even after Confederation the ascendency of Sir John Macdonald could hardly be separated from the coöperation and personal influence of Sir George E. Cartier, who was looked upon as the head of the French interest. The Province of Quebec has always been able to assert its full measure of influence — often a great deal more — in the government at Ottawa, and the fear of its undue control has always been present to the mind of the English-speaking electorate.

Mr. Laurier has changed all this. He is the first French-Canadian to be acknowledged as the chief of both sections of his party, and English-speaking Liberals are as firm in their allegiance to him as are those of his native Province. This is a remarkable achievement, in view of the fact that strong political leadership in the Dominion demands a capacity for harmonizing the sympathies of those who are racially different,

and who have unhappy memories of their former relationship to retard a mutually amicable approach. The character and political record of the man who has overcome such difficulties are of exceptional interest to Canadians, and may easily challenge a wider interest.

It is owing to the fact that eighteen years of his career were spent in opposition, that Mr. Laurier's name has not been more prominently mentioned until recently. His growth to eminence has been steady and unobtrusive, and his reputation has been won with but little help from the power and prestige of office. He was born in the historic city of Quebec on the 20th November, 1841. After finishing his education at L'Assomption College, he studied law, and he was admitted to the bar in 1865. He seems to have early recognized the necessity of a knowledge of the English language to any Frenchman who aspires to more than provincial preferment in Canadian politics, and he applied himself to its study with an assiduity which has splendidly rewarded him. His entrance upon political life was in 1871, when he was elected to represent the district of Drummond and Arthabaska in the Quebec Legislature. He took a prominent part in the deliberations of the Legislature, but in 1874 was elected to the Dominion Parliament. His first speech marked him as a rising man, and enlarged his reputation from provincial to national. It won the hearty applause of leading men in the House, who were surprised to hear the young member from Quebec discussing important questions with a facile mastery of English which any speaker in Parliament might have envied. In 1877 he was given a cabinet position, as Minister of Inland Revenue, in the Mackenzie administration. His tenure of office was brief, as the Liberal Government was defeated in the following year, and from that time until the 23d of last June Mr. Laurier was in opposition.

Sir John Macdonald's return to power in 1878, backed by a very large majority, inaugurated the protective policy, and the Conservative party became strongly entrenched in office. Thus denied an administrative record, Mr. Laurier nevertheless steadily increased in the respect and admiration of both House and country, and on the resignation of the Liberal leadership by Mr. Blake in 1887, he was chosen to succeed him. His elevation to the position did not result from any of the self-seeking arts of the aspiring politician; but it proved

his possession of certain qualities much needed in the guiding counsels of the Liberal party. It is well known that he was strongly averse to the leadership, and had to be solicited with an urgency and unanimity which amounted to a command. His predecessor was a man of great intellectual force, and, though not very successful from a party point of view, was of a political eminence sufficient to cast a shadow on the candidature of any but a potent successor. It was generally thought that both Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Blake, however admirable in other respects, had shown themselves somewhat insensitive to the popular appreciation of winning address, and that their reserve and austerity of manner had something to do with the long term of Liberal failure. In the selection of Mr. Laurier his political friends could not fail to note the gifts of the popular orator, enhanced by a personal manner which won all who came under its influence; but, while crediting him with the possession of more solid talents, they were perhaps not quite so sure that he had the strength of will and political adroitness so necessary to restore the fortunes of his party. He had not been tried in many difficult situations, and the leadership intrusted to him could not be wholly disengaged from the risks of an experiment. The result has proved the wisdom of their choice. Mr. Laurier has shown a capacity for meeting new and unforeseen emergencies; his political ability has expanded with the additional tests imposed upon it.

The recent campaign is a comprehensive illustration of these assertions. The position of the Liberals called for a leader who combined tact and decision, and who could gain the support of Quebec. The Catholic vote in that Province had for many years been pledged to the support of Sir John Macdonald and the Conservative party, and it was deemed almost impossible to win a Liberal majority there. Sir John's influence was paramount, and his administration seemed like a constitutional fixture. During a speech at a banquet given him shortly after his return to power in 1878, he made the laconic boast: "The Grits will never get in power in my time;" and he made good his word to the day of his death. But shortly after 1887 the Liberals discovered that their new leader could hope to rival Sir John himself in many of the influences which win and keep the support, and even the affectionate loyalty, of political followers. Not only so, but he won the good opinion and good will of many Conservatives

who had nothing but cold respect to soften their antagonism to preceding Liberal leaders. Soon the trial of his strength was made under most difficult conditions. He had to marshal the Liberal forces against the protective system, on the one hand, and — seemingly impossible task for one who is himself a spiritual subject of the Pope — against the Roman Catholic hierarchy, on the other. The Manitoba school question, with whose salient points the reading public of the United States are already familiar, arose by reason of the Manitoba Government's refusal to restore the system of Roman Catholic separate schools which had been abolished by that Province in 1890. The question had become one of great importance and perplexity, less by reason of the immediate interests involved than the racial and religious prejudices aroused. Both the main issues, the tariff and the school question, were complicated with others which increased the difficulties to be overcome.

Mr. Laurier's attitude on both questions has made him the undisputed master of the Canadian situation. With regard to the tariff, the platform of the Liberal party between 1887 and 1891 differed from that adopted after the latter date. The Liberals had always opposed protection, but their advocacy of freer trade varied as to the scope and application of that principle. It is generally believed that Mr. Laurier's influence was not predominant in the change which committed his party to the policy of commercial union with the United States. However that may be, the policy was not successful, because it seemed to many to involve the political as well as the commercial autonomy of the Dominion. It gave a rare chance to the Conservatives to ring the changes upon the sentiment of loyalty, and ring them they did with decisive effect. No word or act could be imputed to Mr. Laurier in derogation of his loyalty to Great Britain; but, whether justly or unjustly, his party suffered from the precipitate condemnation of sentiment, and the general election of 1891 went against it. Since then the Liberals have returned to their former policy of a revenue tariff, and the people of Canada have emphatically indorsed it.

Consummate generalship was needed to meet the Manitoba difficulty. The clerical party in that Province, backed by the bishops and priests of Quebec, had set their hearts upon restoring separate schools, and the Conservative leader, Sir Charles

Tupper, is believed to have promised them the political aid of his party in return for their support. It is well known how thoroughgoing that support became. The bishops' mandate was read twice in the Catholic churches of the Province of Quebec, and the faithful were plainly told to vote against the Liberal leader, who was denounced as a recreant son of the Church. How was Mr. Laurier to appeal to his co-religionists in furtherance of a policy which bishop and priest had denounced with the penalties of mortal sin? It was thought at first that he could not withstand the torrent of spiritual wrath which threatened his position. Clearly the crisis demanded the firmest resolution, and he did not hesitate to take it. He ignored the commands of the hierarchy, and defended the intellectual freedom of the Catholic voter in matters beyond the spiritual domain. The result was one of the most significant events recorded in Canadian politics. The Canadian electors, and especially those in Quebec, declared overwhelmingly in his favor. Clerical intolerance was rebuked with a force which may be said to have eliminated it as a disturbing factor in Canadian affairs, and to have emphasized — if it has not rather created — the practical distinction between the Catholic as parishioner and the Catholic as citizen. Quebec will no longer be reproached with political backwardness. It has proved responsive to the promptings of religious toleration. And there is hardly a competent observer in the Dominion who does not admit that Mr. Laurier is the only man under whose leadership this result could have been achieved. None but he could have so revealed to his co-religionists both the duty and the competence of their aroused intelligence. His personal triumph is accentuated by the new hope and wider outlook which accompany it.

He could hardly have inspired his fellow-citizens of Quebec with a spirit of independence if his own views had not been formed in a school of politics which repudiates the all-sufficiency of tradition. He is, in fact, an ardent believer in the doctrines of British Liberalism. The writings and speeches of Burke, Fox, Bright, and Gladstone may be said to represent the trend of his political belief and aspiration. His knowledge of English constitutional precedent is of course qualified by the Canadian conditions of its application; and, although loyal to the mother country, it is the intelligent loyalty of principle which does not forget the differences of

social structure so impossible of reproduction in the democracy of the New World. For the great Republic he has an admiration which doubtless finds its source partly in the fact that the constitution of his own country profited by the American Federal example. In opposition, as well as during his premiership thus far, he has given proof of cordiality of political feeling towards the United States; and he has recently expressed a desire to settle by friendly coöperation several important questions which have caused much irritation between the two countries. Closer trade relations, fisheries, the alien labor law, international deep waterways, — all these matters should, in his own words, "be taken up together and dealt with in a broad, serious, and comprehensive spirit, on one anvil." In harmony with what has been said, it would of course be unwarrantable to impute to him any sympathy with schemes looking to the severance of British connection. Some journals in the United States — one notably — have been persuaded that he covertly holds annexationist views; others, that he hopes yet to see a French-Canadian republic on the banks of the St. Lawrence. His own friends and followers have not been able to discover any evidence of such views or of such a hope.

As a parliamentarian, he has a high degree of tactical skill, amply evidenced by the management of his party in the House of Commons. It may be more correct to say that he wins the devotion of his political supporters, rather than commands their obedience; but, if so, his power of command is not disparaged because veiled by a manner which invites to reason and conciliation. Above all, his party have full confidence in his honesty of purpose, and in his evident desire to unite all classes of the Dominion into a patriotic nationality. This note of patriotism is never absent from his speeches; and, although proud of his French origin, and sensitive to the claims of French achievement and tradition, he always subordinates them to the higher claims of his country. In debate he has shown a strength of argument and a resource in reply fully convincing to those who were accustomed to regard him as an orator of the feelings rather than the reason. There is an attractiveness about his public speaking which is partly owing to the circumstances under which he acquired proficiency, and is enhanced by a fine presence and grace of action.

He has won his laurels in a foreign tongue, and it may be doubted whether any Frenchman, in Canada or beyond it, ever gained such a mastery of English. Two or three of his speeches rank among the best ever heard in the Dominion Parliament. At a mass meeting in Toronto addressed by him during the "Equal Rights" agitation, and when public indignation in regard to the Jesuits' Estates bill was at its height, he won admiration by the skill with which he parried hostile interruptions, and by his candid statement of a very difficult situation; the large audience was deeply moved when, at the close of a powerful appeal for mutual forbearance, he said, in a manner and tone which lent unusual effect to his words: "Let us remember that, though we kneel at different altars, we both worship the same God." An empty truism, some would say; but those who heard it were lifted above contention into a region of charity and peace. His enunciation of English is marked by a slight French accent which has more of charm than fault to those who hear him, reminding one in this respect of Wendell Phillips's saying about O'Connell: "His tones had just enough of the brogue to sweeten them." The death of Sir John Macdonald called forth many eloquent tributes in the House of Commons; but none of them was comparable to that spoken by Mr. Laurier, whose words fittingly voiced the pathos and solemnity of a memorable occasion.

No Canadian leader before him could speak to English and French audiences with equal ease, nor could any of them know, as he does, the sympathies and antipathies which such audiences severally hold. He understands the racial temper and attitude which are so easily opposed, and he has conscientiously tried to reconcile them. Hence the trust of the people in him; hence, the loyalty and coöperation of his colleagues from Ontario and the Maritime Provinces. Sir Oliver Mowat, after a twenty-two years' term as premier of Ontario, — a term which might have been indefinitely prolonged, — left the provincial for the federal arena to serve under him as Minister of Justice; the premiers of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick likewise resigned their positions, and were glad to enter his cabinet. It is felt that his record harmonizes with his professions. There have been scandals and corruption in Canadian politics, but no taint of suspicion ever attached to Mr. Laurier. His character as a man can well

support the reputation of the orator and the statesman. His countrymen are convinced that the field of opportunity so rapidly broadening before him will be filled with the deeds which spring from honorable and patriotic intentions.

If it were asked what predominant quality has given Mr. Laurier his leadership, it would be difficult to name it. Those who know him best speak of the symmetry and balance of his powers. A party leader over such diverse elements must hold his judgment well in equipoise; too many points of exceptional strength and contrast would betray some related weaknesses. It is quite probable that at first the evenness of his intellectual manifestation led some to doubt his strength, because the qualities they were looking for were held in abeyance. Some who conversed with him came away delighted with his urbanity and frank unreserve, but thought he lacked the force to pull the Liberal party out of the slough of despond. To-day the same men are praising his resolute will and quick decision. All are agreed that he bore himself with admirable steadiness during a most exciting campaign; the calm counsel, the eloquent appeal, the ringing protest, were given as they were needed, without a trace of personal animosity, and with a judgment vindicated by the result. It is fortunate for his party that he brings to its direction a capacity tried and proved during the long period of Liberal reverse; there are few political mistakes during the past twenty years of Canadian politics whose lessons have been unlearned by him. Thus far his tactics of leadership have been almost perfect, and if they are equalled by his success as an administrator, time alone is necessary to give him an unsurpassed position among his countrymen.

NEW EXPERIMENTS IN SHEATHING THE HULLS OF SHIPS.

By GEORGE ETHELBERT WALSH.

SOME notable experiments recently made in this country and Europe have brought the problem of protecting iron and steel hulls from becoming foul and corroded nearer to a satisfactory solution than ever before in the history of shipbuilding. Away back in the seventeenth century it was considered necessary to sheathe the bottoms of vessels with some anti-fouling material, and we have early records of various attempts to protect ships from the barnacles and marine growths that would attach themselves to the bottoms of every craft that sailed the blue sea. In an old Japanese newspaper a curious account is given of an experiment in sheathing the bottom of an old junk of 800 tons burden with iron, in 1613, and if we are to believe this report the credit must be given to the Japanese for first applying iron plates in shipbuilding. Copper was not applied to the sheathing of vessels until 1761.

The old wooden vessels had two great enemies in the ocean to contend with, and to circumvent them the early shipbuilders of every civilized country invented peculiar compounds and sheathing materials. The barnacles attached themselves to the bottoms of the wooden vessels in such numbers that their speed was materially reduced, and the *Teredo navalis*, or shipworm, performed such ravages in the stout timbers that the life of a vessel in the tropic seas was made comparatively short. From time immemorial, these two marine growths have puzzled the brains of scientists and shipbuilders, and they are to-day the most costly enemies that governments and private shipowners have to fight. With the advent of iron and steel ships, the *Teredo navalis* was rendered ineffective in its operations, but a new enemy was introduced in shipping circles that more than made up for the advantage gained.

Corrosion of iron and steel bottoms is a subject that concerns the naval authorities of every nation and the operators

of every great steamship line. This subtle but all-powerful enemy is lying in wait to attack every vessel that is launched; and it has cost the world millions of dollars up to the present time. When steel plates were substituted for iron, it was hoped that corrosion would be partially controlled, but every time a modern steamer or war-vessel, plated with steel, comes into contact with any submerged copper, galvanic action begins, and corrosion rapidly follows. If an unsheathed steamer is anchored alongside of a copper-sheathed vessel, the work of corrosion soon injures the bottom of the former to such an extent that docking and repairing are absolutely necessary. Naval authorities recognize this, and strict orders obtain in the Navy, forbidding an unsheathed cruiser to anchor alongside of a sheathed vessel or to moorings used for a copper-sheathed steamer. A few years ago the practice vessel "Bancroft" and the cruiser "Cincinnati" had their bottoms seriously injured through a mistake in not observing this order.

The question of protecting the bottoms of ships is thus fraught with more difficulties than the average observer imagines. The wooden vessels demand a sheathing that will destroy the barnacles that tend to accumulate upon it, and one that is impenetrable to the *Teredo navalis*, or shipworm. The iron and steel ships require protection to the submerged parts of the hulls from the barnacles and corrosion that daily threaten their speed and usefulness.

A recent report that a paint had been invented by a workman in the Pensacola Navy Yard, which, after a severe test by a commission, had been found to be perfectly proof against the teredo, makes a few words about the shipworm interesting. It is not likely that this enemy will prove inimical to the life of our larger vessels much longer, for a perfect sheathing that will protect the bottoms from the barnacles and corrosion will also be proof against the action of the worm. But a teredo-proof paint will be of inestimable value to the owners of small ships, and to the cities owning dock property in warm waters. On the Pacific coast wharves are frequently ruined by the teredo in a year or two after construction. At San Francisco, New Orleans, and other ports of the Gulf coast, docks have been completely undermined and rendered unsafe for heavy burdens shortly after the piles were first driven into the mud, notwithstanding that they had been coated with tar and other preparations. Wooden vessels in these waters soon succumb

to the attacks of the shipworm, and property is destroyed to such an extent that some teredo-proof paint is imperatively demanded. So far a copper sheathing only has been found to answer the purpose; but as it is not always possible to sheathe the piles of docks with copper, it may be surmised that a paint such as the naval commission is reported to have tested successfully will be a godsend.

Copper sheathing of the bottoms of vessels is an expensive matter, and small craft of less than a hundred tons burden will hardly repay the outlay required. The ease with which they can be docked, and their bottoms scraped of all barnacles, renders it unnecessary to go to the expense of copper-sheathing simply for protection from the barnacles. But at present nearly all wooden ships sailing in tropical seas must have copper-sheathed bottoms in order to save their timbers from being honeycombed by the teredo. Corrosive sublimate has been found the most effective poison to the teredo, and scores of paints and preparations have been made, with mercurial salts as their chief foundation, to protect wooden bottoms from the shipworm. But as all these paints soon lose their effectiveness, it is just about as easy and much cheaper to run the ships into fresh water every few months. This method has been found just as efficacious as floating them in basins into which large quantities of corrosive sublimate have been poured.

The barnacles yield to the same kind of poisons as the *Teredo navalis*, and copper and copper solutions, mercury, zinc, and arsenic have been combined into a hundred different kinds of paints to protect the hulls of ships from these marine growths. A fortune is awaiting the man who can invent a preparation that will effectually destroy both barnacles and teredo. There are preservatives used to-day that prove effective for a short time, but they are far from answering the purposes required of them. The barnacles attack alike wooden and steel ships, rendering docking and scraping necessary at short intervals. The patent compositions have helped wonderfully to extend the time during which the vessels can sail in tropical seas without becoming so fouled by marine growths that their speed is reduced one-half.

In the search for a perfect hull-protector, the European navies have experimented with nearly all the preservatives put on the market; but copper sheathing has not yet been

excelled either as an anti-fouler or anti-corrosive material. From 1620 to 1770 the English and Colonial shipbuilders used lead as a sheathing material, and this was put on with great copper nails. The colonists also used a mixture of tar, pitch, and brimstone. But after half a century's trial both of these sheathing materials were found to be inadequate, and copper was employed. The sheathing was done in a crude way, but on the old wooden ships it answered the purpose very well. It protected the bottoms from both the teredo and the barnacles. But when iron and steel hulls were first sheathed with copper considerable trouble followed. A slight break or opening in the plates would permit the salt water to enter, and corrosion would progress so rapidly that frequent examinations were necessary. The British navy made the first successful experiments in copper-sheathing their iron cruisers intended for service in warm seas, beginning in 1868 with the "Inconstant." Between that period and 1889 thirty-two vessels of the English navy were copper-sheathed.

In spite of all precautions, however, leaks in the copper-sheathing would occur, and after a vessel had been launched a year or two "pitting" would begin at various places. These "pittings" were the beginnings of corrosion, and they had to be repaired, or in a year or two great damage would be done to the hulls. In copper-sheathing the "Inconstant" the British Admiralty had the vessel flush-plated, with heavy seam straps on the outside. The after-process is thus described by Chief Constructor Hichborn:

Into these seam straps were tapped the fastenings for teak frames, which were worked on the skin plating. A course of plank was worked on the outside of these teak frames, fastened thereto by lag screws, all fastenings having the heads sunk and covered by insulating material, and the whole covered by copper sheathing. . . . In 1889 a new departure was taken. It was considered desirable to dispense with the lag screws, as the probable source of most of the leakage, it being found practically impossible to so fit the thousands of chest bolts required as to be sure that none of them, or the holes to receive them, should penetrate the skin, giving access to the water. To do this the outer course of sheathing was dispensed with, the change involving also a large item of economy. . . . According to the latest practice the plank is preferably of teak, worked in twelve-inch strakes sufficiently thick to give a good calking seam, or

from three-and-one-half to four inches finished. The bolts are of naval brass, three-quarters of an inch in the shank, reduced to eleven-sixteenths over the thread, the heads being one-and-one-half inches in diameter, and sunk a sufficient depth to be from five-eighths to three-fourths of an inch below the surface when finished, and being well set up so as to compress the wood under the heads one-eighth of an inch. A nut is fitted on the point bearing on a thin iron washer, and after being finally hove up, the thread is centre-punched to check it. Hempen grommets, saturated in a mixture of red and white lead, are carefully fitted both under the washer and head of bolt, and the recess over the head is filled with Portland cement. The bolts are staggered with about fifteen inches pitch, except at the butts, each butt having four bolts. After the fastening is completed, in order to fill up as far as possible all spaces that may exist between the plank and the skin, holes are bored in the centre of each strake of plank, about six feet apart, and a composition of red and white lead is pumped in under pressure until it comes out at the adjoining holes, care being taken to limit the pressure, that it will not injuriously strain the fastening, after which the holes are carefully plugged.

During the past five or six years over thirty English war-vessels have been copper-sheathed in this way, and the English Admiralty makes it a practice to have every one sheathed that is built for service in foreign waters where docking facilities are poor. None of our war-ships have been copper-sheathed. When the cruisers "Chicago," "Boston," "Atlanta," and the "Dolphin" were built, the question of sheathing them came up before the Naval Advisory Board, and it was decided not to add the extra expense to them. The reasons for this conclusion were threefold. One was of expense, it being estimated that it would cost $75,000 to copper-sheathe the "Chicago," and a little less for the other cruisers. Another important objection was that it would add so greatly to the weight of the ships that speed would be sacrificed to it. The increase to the weight of the "Chicago" would be about 255 tons, to the "Boston" and "Atlanta" 160 tons, and to the "Dolphin" 117 tons. A third reason for the adverse report of the Board to copper-sheathing was that even the improved methods of to-day did not fully meet all requirements. A slight derangement of the plates of copper, or a scratch, might expose the steel hull, so that galvanic action would instantly begin. Besides, copper is not a perfect anti-fouler, and ships sheathed

with this metal have to be docked and scraped at certain intervals. A war-ship doing service in foreign waters may go a year or two without being docked if the bottom is properly sheathed with copper, but at the end of that period scraping is useful if not imperative. Unless the copper-sheathing is done with the utmost care, and under the most approved methods, it does not serve the purpose much better than the patent anti-fouling paints now used in our navy.

The reasons for this are plain. All the anti-fouling compositions imitate as nearly as possible the action of copper, and they are made up of copper, mercury, zinc, or arsenic. They cover every part of the ship with a smooth, plain surface that offers no resistance to the water, and protects the iron from rust. The barnacles are killed by the poisons from the anti-fouling paints, or by the copper sheathing when they attach themselves to the bottom of the vessels. The small marine animals absorb the poison from the copper, and drop off in the water dead. The poison can be produced only by the gradual dissolution of the copper paint or the copper sheathing, and unless they do dissolve rapidly enough to poison the animals they would be useless. It takes longer for the copper sheathing to dissolve than for the poisonous paints, but in other respects it is not much superior to the patent compounds now in use.

The latest experiments in protecting the hulls of ships from barnacles and corrosion, and incidentally wooden ships from the teredo, have been along the line of electroplating with copper. The consensus of opinion of all scientists seems to be that copper is the best material for sheathing the hulls, and if this could be put on at less expense, and in such a way that it would add only a trifle more to the weight of the craft, and more thoroughly protect the steel hulls from corrosion, the question would be finally solved. By electroplating with copper the sides and bottoms of ships, all the difficulties that have heretofore puzzled shipbuilders seem to be overcome. The trial of electroplating the hull of a sea-going craft was made over a year ago, and the results appear to be highly satisfactory. This method is very simple — in fact, just as easy as plating any small article. After the ship is docked and the bottom and sides are thoroughly scraped and cleaned, she is practically placed in a bath of copper sulphate into which is passed an electric current.

In order to accomplish this work successfully on a large scale liquid-tight boxes are fitted to conform to the hull of the ship, and when these are filled with a solution of copper, they are screwed up so snugly to the bottom that no air or liquid can escape from below. The top of the boxes is left open in order to admit the current. The iron hull of the ship acts as the negative pole, and when the circuit is formed a deposit of copper is gradually formed outside of the hull of the steamer. This film of copper is absolutely air-tight and perfect in formation, fitting so tightly to the iron hull that it can be removed only with the greatest difficulty. In forty-eight hours it is one-sixteenth of an inch thick, and weighs 2.85 pounds to the square foot. When the whole surface of the bottom has been electroplated with copper in this way, the skin makes a surface so smooth and unbroken that no weak spots can possibly be found. "Pitting" is out of the question, for no nails are used in the whole operation. The copper does not break easily, as it fits so closely to the iron plates that it is necessary sometimes to chip off the iron to separate the two. The copper skin makes a perfect water-tight protection to the ship, and in an instance where the steel backing or plates should crack, it would add greatly to the safety of the ship. The electroplating method, thus briefly described, seems like a long stride toward the complete solution of the old problem of protecting the hulls of wooden and iron ships.

But while all difficulties for complete protection of the bottoms seem to be removed by this new process of copper-sheathing, another method should be mentioned, not because it will yield any valuable points to shipbuilders, but on account of its originality and peculiarity. The Japanese, with true Oriental foresight, have developed a method of sheathing vessels that for a time attracted the attention of every navy in the world, and more than one European war-vessel has her bottom protected in this way. Japanese lacquer possesses many fine qualities that have made a world-wide reputation for the articles covered with it, but very few know that it has been utilized in covering the hulls of steamers. When Japan began to buy war-vessels for her new navy, she encountered the same difficulties in preserving their hulls as the European nations. A lacquer manufacturer of Tokio, a Mr. Hotta, made an experiment in covering several plates of

iron with prepared lacquer, and after they had been recovered from the sea several months later they were found to be unattacked by barnacles, teredos, or corrosion.

The results of this first experiment naturally led to more extensive tests at the Yokosuka dockyard. The composition of the lacquer was slightly changed, chemicals being added to make it more effective. After several abortive attempts to make a useful lacquer for covering iron and steel plates, success was attained, and the steamer "Fuso-kan" was docked, and 1,200 feet of her bottom was covered. In 1886 she was launched, and in the following year she was docked again to examine her bottom. The condition of the lacquered portion of the ship was so satisfactory that the Admiralty thought they had accidentally solved the question that had agitated European navies for centuries, and every part of the ship's bottom was lacquered by the new process to demonstrate thoroughly the value of the discovery. After the lacquer was put on, an anti-fouling paint was applied over it. For two successive years the "Fuso-kan" was docked, and after an examination her bottom was found so perfect that she was launched again without repairs.

The firm of Hotta & Company, as the original discoverers of the new process of sheathing, was given the contract to lacquer other vessels of the Japanese navy. Up to date they have lacquered six of the first-class cruisers and battleships, and five torpedo boats. They next advertised for the patronage of other nations, and they succeeded in obtaining commissions from the Russian Government to lacquer the warships "Dmitri Donskoi" and "Admiral Nachimoff." They made a bid for the work of lacquering the new cruisers of the United States Navy, and in 1890 they sent over several lacquered plates to the United States Naval authorities to have them tested. These steel plates were submerged at the Norfolk Navy Yard in 1891, and they were taken up three months later. In some places the lacquer had peeled off, and barnacles and corrosion had performed their work at such spots; but where the lacquer coating was intact, the surface was as smooth and free from all defects as the day the plates were submerged. Another consignment of lacquered plates was sent over and tested; but they did not prove perfect, although it was thought at the time that the trouble was due to the imperfection of the lacquer. In the report to the Navy

Department concerning the tests, these words were added to sum up the results:

> The lacquer appears to be an admirable anti-corrosive and anti-fouler, excepting as regards its tendency to blister. These blisters differ from the usual paint blisters, as the elasticity and tenacity of the lacquer cause it to be loosened over a greater area.

The lacquer coating certainly has many qualifications to recommend it as a coating for ships' bottoms, but no expert is yet prepared to say that it will ever displace copper sheathing, or that it will in the general run give as good results. Of two other plates submerged at the New York Navy Yard it was found that the first taken up was in just as good condition as the day it was put under the water, but the other had the lacquer raised and cracked in places so that rust could begin its work. Anti-fouling and anti-corrosive paints are either mixed with the lacquer, or applied to the bottom of the ship afterward. The method of lacquering the vessel is simple, but the whole expense of the operation is high, amounting to about thirteen cents a square foot. This is one of the serious drawbacks to its general adoption.

When the ship is docked for lacquering, all the old paint and rust are carefully scraped off until the surface is smooth and free from all obstacles. Screens are raised around the sides of the ship to facilitate the drying of the lacquer, and in cold weather stoves are kept burning inside of the screens. The direct rays of the sun falling upon the lacquer tend to blister it, and consequently the screens are necessary to protect the film until it has partly dried. The first coat of lacquer is applied with wooden spatulas, and then worked down to a thin uniform coat with brushes. The coat has to be very thin, and yet so uniform that no part of the surface is neglected. Only skilled workmen are employed; and one man can cover about 500 square feet in a day of eight hours. The second coat is applied when the first is thoroughly dry, and mica or kaolin is mixed with the lacquer.

Four or five protective coats are applied after this, followed by an anti-fouling coat of some prepared composition. Sometimes three anti-fouling coats are put on before a good job is finished. In each succeeding coat the quantity of mercurial salts is increased. The lacquer and the protective and anti-fouling materials all dry rapidly, and the ship is generally

ready for launching within ten days after she is first taken out of the water.

Zinc has been used to some extent by the European navies for sheathing their war-vessels; but this does not act as well in salt water as copper, and it is merely a matter of time before it will be entirely abandoned.

From these tests and experiments it seems safe to conclude that the consensus of opinion is in favor of copper for sheathing vessels to protect them from salt water and marine growths, and that by the new process of electroplating a long step in advance has been made. Lacquer is next in importance and value to copper, but because of its uncertainty and tendency to crack and blister it will never become a successful agent. It may in time become valuable for certain kinds of work, such as covering the skin of small vessels, and for protecting docks and buoys from the corroding effects of salt water; but it will hardly excel copper in any other field of shipbuilding.

FALLING PRICES.

By DEAN GORDON.

WE have heard much lately of falling prices and their alleged baneful influence upon business progress, prosperity, and wealth, and but little in defence of the beneficent tendency of general falling prices towards a higher, grander, greater, and happier civilization.

General prices are the thermometer of social progress. They fall as we progress in ingenuity and civilization, and rise as we retrograde. This holds true, however, only during such a period of time as when the money standard in which prices are estimated remains fixed and unchanged, and has not itself substantially fluctuated in value, and only when applied to the general average of prices. During a period of the general rise or decline of prices, particular commodities may go up or down, at variance with the general tendency of prices, on account of peculiar conditions applicable to them, which have no application to other commodities.

A decline or rise in the value of the metal composing the standard money unit would cause an apparent contrary rise or decline in all prices of other commodities in the exact reverse proportion to such decline or rise in the money metal value; but such change in prices, due to the change in money value, would not vary the exchange value or power of commodities in the slightest degree. A load of hay sold at $5, and the $5 expended for a coat, is an exchange of so much hay for a coat. If the metal in the money should fall in value one-half, the same hay would sell for $10, and the same coat would cost $10. The hay and the coat would still be exchange equals. The reverse would follow if the money metal should double in value. In that case the hay would sell for $2.50, and the coat for $2.50. The power of these two commodities to exchange for each other would remain the same, no matter in what price they were estimated. Prices, therefore, which rise or fall because of a fall or rise in money, must be discounted or added to in the ratio of the fall or rise of the money in order to compare accurately the exchange value or power of commodities at one period of time with

any other period of time. But, as stated, when there is no fluctuation in the value of the money standard, the rise or fall in general prices is an unfailing rule by which may be determined the fall or rise in social economy and progress.

Prices are simply the expression of the ratio at which things exchange for other things as compared with a third thing called money. Things exchange for other things in the ratio of the cost of production of each. One thing is equivalent in exchange value to another thing when they are both produced at the same cost of labor and capital. A bicycle, the cost of which is $100, is the exchange equal of a buggy, the cost of which is $100. One will buy, or exchange for, the other, if not directly, then indirectly, by commuting one into money, and with the money buying the other. Four suits of clothes, costing to produce $25 each, would be the exchange equal of either the buggy or the bicycle, and eight such suits would exchange for both.

Higher prices for all things, when expressed in a fixed and unchanged currency, do not indicate prosperity, but indicate that a less number or quantity of things exchange for a correspondingly less number or quantity of other things. As prices rise fewer bicycles, as expressed in money, will exchange for a like less number of buggies. If prices doubled, $1,000 would bring about the exchange of but five bicycles and five buggies, where it effected the exchange of ten of each before.

General falling prices mean that a correspondingly increased number or quantity of things will exchange for a like increase in number or quantity of other things. It means that while John Smith is, by experience, invention, increased skill, and ingenuity, increasing his ability to make more and better bicycles with a given amount of labor and capital. Sam Jones is doing likewise, in the manufacture of buggies. When bicycles fall in price from $100 to $50, and buggies from $100 to $50, it simply means that John Smith can create twice as many bicycles now, with the same labor and capital, that he formerly could, or at one-half the cost, or at the exertion and use of one-half the labor and capital; and that while Smith does this with bicycles, Jones does the same thing with buggies. Smith and Jones can now exchange two bicycles for two buggies at the same cost to each that one bicycle and buggy cost each before.

When bicycles and buggies cost $100 each to produce them, the exchange of one for the other amounted to the exchange of a given amount of labor and earning capacity of capital, expended on bicycles, for a like amount of labor and capital's earning capacity, expended on buggies. When both fall in price to $50, it is because the same amount of labor and capital yields to the manufacturer of each twice what it did before in quantity of bicycles and buggies. Each is benefited 100 per cent by the 100 per cent increase in the creative capacity of the other. While the bicycles and buggies have fallen one-half in price, they have at the same time doubled in exchange on purchasing power. It is this fact that shows the progress indicated by falling prices.

What applies to bicycles and buggies applies equally to all other commodities. All people are alike benefited by the increased power of the commodities they produce to purchase other commodities which they need. When, under normal conditions, general prices are falling, the power of commodities and labor to exchange for a larger amount, and better quality, of other commodities and labor, increases in an exactly equivalent ratio.

Higher prices would follow if man should go backward in his ability to create the useful things of life. As he made less in quantity, and made them poorer in quality, with a given amount of labor and capital, this retrograding tendency being at work in the skill of all labor and the production of all commodities alike, the resultant rising prices would mean, the lessening in a corresponding ratio of the power of labor and commodities to exchange for or purchase other commodities.

Falling of prices is the result of the increasing and rising power of labor to create with the same labor better, and more of, the useful things of life, or the same amount of such things with correspondingly less labor. As we all exchange the fruits of our toil for the fruits of the toil of others, we all share in the blessings of this increasing creative and earning power of labor alike. It means that it takes less and less labor to provide ourselves with the necessaries and luxuries of life, and becomes easier and easier to live and accumulate capital every day that we go forward in the direction of lower prices. When the mercury of prices is falling, the scale of civilization is rising. The luxuries of the few of yesterday have become the common heritage and necessities

of the many to-day. The poor of to-day will become the well-to-do and the rich of to-morrow. The laborer to-day becomes the employer of a few years hence.

The farmer who hauls his wheat to market and gets less in price for it now, as expressed in dollars, than he formerly did, gets correspondingly more of and better other things, for the purpose of getting which he sells his wheat, than he formerly did. He does not sell his wheat because he wants money. With it he cannot satisfy his hunger, shelter himself, clothe himself, fence his farm, or produce heat in his fireplace; but he can, and does, with its ready power of conversion into groceries, shingles, clothes, wire, and coal, accomplish all of these things. When he sells his wheat for money, he merely exchanges his wheat for other commodities which he needs; and the owners of such other commodities exchange them for his wheat, which they need. The owners of the commodities which the farmer needs, when prices have fallen, get more wheat for them than formerly; and the farmer, on the other hand, gets more of the commodities he needs for his wheat than he formerly did. The advantage to each is mutual. It takes less labor to produce the same wheat, or more wheat is produced with the same labor; and so, also, with other commodities which the wheat purchases. The farmer who labors to produce wheat, since he exchanges that wheat for other things which he uses and consumes, really labors to produce those things which he ultimately uses and consumes; and if he gets more of such things now than formerly, his labor is better rewarded than formerly, no matter in what prices, figures, or numbers, his wheat crop is estimated.

If now ten bushels of wheat, at fifty cents a bushel, will buy, or exchange for, one ton of coal at $5 a ton, and in future years wheat should fall in price to five cents a bushel, and coal to fifty cents a ton, the ten bushels of wheat and the ton of coal would each be as valuable as before, because they would still be exchange equivalents and would buy each other. Such fall in price of each would show that the same labor on the farm that now produces ten bushels of wheat would then produce one hundred bushels, and that the same labor at the mine that now produces one ton of coal would then produce ten tons. The farmer would get the benefit of the increased power of labor to produce coal, and the miner would be correspondingly benefited by the

increased power of labor to produce wheat. As the laborer produces and creates, by exchange, that which he ultimately uses and consumes, the farmer would then get ten tons of coal for the same labor that he formerly exerted to get one, and the miner would get one hundred bushels of wheat for the same labor he formerly expended to get ten bushels.

A general rise in prices represents a general loss in the creative energy of labor and capital, and a general decline in prices represents a general gain in the creative energy of labor and capital.

The disposition of men is to want higher prices for what they have to sell, and lower prices for what they are compelled to buy. They vainly seek to obtain all kinds of legislation that will produce this result. The farmer opposes option-dealing in wheat, because he thinks that the sale of wheat which does not exist, has the same effect on the market as though it did exist, and tends to increase the supply, and thus lower the price. He forgets that there are far more people interested in a lower cost for this kind of food than there are people who have it for sale and want the price higher. The poor of the larger cities oppose option-dealing in wheat because, as it appears to them, the purchase, for future delivery, of wheat which does not exist, creates the same demand for wheat as if it did exist, and consequently raises the price to them of the food they must buy. Selling wheat short, however, does not have the slightest possible tendency to lower the price of wheat, except, upon certain contingencies, temporarily. Where a million bushels are sold for future delivery, there must be a buyer for the same million bushels. The transaction is as much a purchase as a sale. It is no more one than the other. The sale of the million bushels which do not exist, increases the supply by just so much as the purchase of the same million bushels increases the demand, and one exactly offsets the other. The sale does not tend to lower the wheat price any more than the purchase does to raise it. But the reasons for the opposition to option-dealing by these two classes of people illustrate the desire for higher prices by the seller and for lower prices for the buyer.

The most recent illustration of this popular demand for legislation proposing to make higher prices for the seller and lower prices for the buyer was seen in the late campaign by the great clamor for a cheaper money standard, a

cheaper dollar; a dollar that should have but one-half the purchasing power of the present dollar; a dollar that should represent in value the decline of average commodities since 1873; a dollar that would take less of commodities to get, and would raise prices. Such a change in the money standard would result ultimately in the raising of all prices of land, labor, and commodities, by just so much as the value of the dollar was reduced; if one hundred per cent, then prices would double. But this would neither help nor injure anyone, when things once became adjusted to the new standard, so far as new transactions were concerned. Commodities and labor would still exchange for the same amount of other labor and commodities as before. The change that would raise the price of wheat or other things you had to sell, would to the same extent raise the price of those things you had to buy with the money received for what you sold. Men buy money not to keep, but to sell again. Higher prices for goods would mean lower prices, or less goods, for money sold.

If Congress should enact that copper cents should be dollars and legal tender for all debts, and a load of hay before the act took effect was worth $5, and a coat worth $5, the hay and the coat would still be equal in exchange power; one would exchange for the other, or sell for the money that would get the other, which is the same thing. The new act would raise the price of the hay to 500 (cent) dollars, and the same law would make the coat worth 500 (cent) dollars. They would exchange for each other just as before. Some think that this process, in some inconceivable manner, would raise the price of all things for the seller, and lower the price of all things for the buyer, and thus enrich every one at no one's expense. But if the price of a suit of clothes is raised for the seller, it cannot at the same time be lowered for the buyer. This can no more happen than one hundred men can each outrun all the others, or than each picket of a fence can be higher than all the others. Every sale is a purchase, and every purchase is a sale. For some reason we have come to look upon the man who gives money for goods as the buyer, and the man who gives goods for money as a seller. But each party to the transaction is both buyer and seller. One sells money for goods, and buys goods with money; the other sells goods for money, and buys money with goods.

The law that will increase the number of dollars that the

farmer gets for his wheat, will also increase in exactly the same ratio the number of dollars that the merchant must have for the goods the farmer will get by the sale of his wheat.

It has been claimed that, the value of the dollar remaining fixed and stationary for a number of years, and all other commodities as measured by it having declined 100 per cent, the dollar has become a 200-cent dollar, or, in other words, that it requires twice the commodities to buy the dollar that it formerly did, and that this fact makes the fixed dollar a hardship to the debtor, who has to pay his debt with twice the commodities that the debt represented when contracted. With a dollar of stationary value and declining commodities, it is true, it takes more and more commodities to get the dollar as the commodities decline; but it is not true that this is unjust to the debtor. Under such conditions to permit the debtor to pay with the same quantity of commodities as the debt stood for when contracted would be most unjust to the creditor.

For illustration, suppose, ten years ago Jones, who had no money or property, wanted to go into the bicycle business in a small way. He borrowed of Smith $1,000, payable in ten years, and with it bought ten bicycles, and commenced the sale of wheels. The bicycles cost $100 apiece. It took the labor of two men one year to create ten of them. Jones, when he borrowed $1,000, borrowed really what he exchanged the money for, the ten bicycles, and when he borrowed the ten bicycles, he borrowed that which produced them, the labor of two men for one year. Ten years expire, and pay day comes. Bicycles have declined in price or value to $50 apiece. Jones now has to sell twenty bicycles to get the $1,000 to pay Smith, or twice the number of bicycles that he got with the $1,000 when he borrowed it. But bicycles now are worth only $50, because by inventions, improvements in machinery for their manufacture, and the increase in expertness of the labor employed in the manufacture of them, one man can do what ten years ago it required two to do. Two men can now make twenty bicycles instead of ten, in one year. Jones borrowed ten bicycles, the product of the labor of two men one year, and he now pays the loan with twenty bicycles, but which are the product only of the labor of two men for one year. It was two men's labor for a year that he borrowed; it is that which he returns, no more or less. If Smith had

not made the loan, but kept the money till now, he could have bought the twenty bicycles with it himself. To permit Jones to pay Smith with the same number of bicycles that he borrowed would be to permit him to give back the labor of *one* man for one year, whereas he borrowed the labor of *two* men for one year. He would thus cheat the creditor out of one-half of his just dues.

Those who deplore falling prices, also witness with resentment the advent of the electric motor, because it displaces the use of the horse and lowers his value; and the marvellous increase in labor-saving machinery, because, for the time being, it lessens the number of laborers needed. To be consistent, they should also resist the tendency to a decrease in train wrecks and bridge disasters, as it lessens the number of laborers needed in wrecking crews, and in crutch and coffin factories. They should oppose the construction of fire-proof buildings and modern fire-department appliances for the extinguishment of flames, because they decrease the number of fires, and this in turn decreases the number of carpenters, bricklayers, plasterers, ironworkers, and other artisans needed in reconstruction, as well as decreases insurance rates and the army of insurance agents. They should resist the decrease in crime and litigation, because this means less work for sheriffs, bailiffs, court clerks, jurors, and lawyers. And they should with equal vehemence denounce the growing knowledge of the people with reference to health, sanitary laws, physical ailments and their prevention, because it tends to throw out of employment physicians, pill-makers, hearse-builders, and gravediggers.

Inventions, when they come into use suddenly, seem to work a hardship where they throw men out of employment and decrease prices, but this loss to those directly affected is more than compensated for by inventions at work in other lines, which lessen the cost to them of things they have to buy.

Every useful invention, every labor-saving machine, every day of human experience, is reflected in falling prices; and falling prices mean that human ingenuity, skill, and learning are extracting more and more good, with less and less labor, from the magnanimous resources of nature, and that life each day becomes easier to live and more worth living.

WICHITA, KANSAS.

MACEO'S DEATH.

BY A. E. BALL.

THE noblest hero of them all,
The last one of thy kin to fall,
'T is sad to sing thy requiem!
The mingled bloods of black and white,
Flowed from thy veins in Freedom's fight,
And nobly hast thou honored them.

And thou wast Cuba's ideal man,
Who fought her battles in the van,
Chief patriot of thy native land.
Of manhood, too, she finds in thee
Her highest type, her liberty,
A martyr worshipfully grand.

The victim of a wily foe,
Where duty called, there wouldst thou go,
Nor heeded what in store had Fate.
For thou to stop the flow of blood,
Which deluged Cuba with its flood,
Hast lost thy life, as good as great.

Let Cuba's daughters weep for thee;
More loved than pearls such tears will be,
More precious far than richest spoil.
Thy ashes, too, though hid from sight,
As Moses' were on Pisgah's height,
Will hallow ever Cuban soil.

Sown dragon's teeth turn armèd men,
So Maceo's spirit lives again,
And cries for vengeance in his name.
A thousand hands each grasp a brand,
To strike for Freedom and the land
He loved, and strive to share his fame.

For ages will Maceo's name
Be potent as a tongue of flame
To set the patriot soul on fire.
And while the world goes round and round,
If foes to Freedom shall be found,
The son will learn it from his sire.

THE FOUNDATION OF A COLONY OF SELF-SUPPORTING ARTISTS.

APPEAL.

MEN AND WOMEN ARTISTS:

THE time has come when we poets, painters, sculptors, and musicians must unite to free ourselves and Art from the overwhelming spirit of the age, — Commercialism and Sensuality.

The strong undercurrent of idealism impels us to become the prophets whose mission it is to herald the dawn of a new age of Heroism and Poetry which shall triumph over and check the further reign of a barbarous civilization.

We have suffered long enough in humility; we have begged our bread too often of editors, critics, and connoisseurs — Art speculators, who are the greatest hinderers of idealism, and have nothing to do with Art but to debase it; we will no longer sell our birthright. Those among us who have no means of sustenance need no longer be cut off from answering the voice of their soul. We must come together, as the strongest men and women of other nations when oppressed have done before, becoming intellectual pioneers of a new state.

To realize fully the hour, compare the spirit of Art, politics, and enlightenment of to-day with that of any other age. If we are artists we must despise our cities, our false civilization, and our cold, spiritless religions.

Let us, artists of all nations, withdraw ourselves from their midst, unmindful of our nationality and our present customs, in which we can have but little pride, estranged as we are from our own kind. As artists, we are brothers, and the difference in nationality cannot separate us. We will leave exhibitions, salons, and theatres (markets made for speculations) to journeymen and hirelings who are willing to pamper the vulgar tastes of the bourgeoisie. Art is ignored in this age, so uninitiated in divine things; and, being ahead of the age, we cannot look to it for support. To wait for destiny to help us is perhaps never to realize our hopes. There are those

who have said they will *die* for Art; but we will *live* for it. Separated, we can do nothing against the reign of ignorance; scattered, our works will be destroyed, with the places unworthy of them, by the wars and revolutions which are already at hand.

Let us unite and return to the natural life of primitive men of the soil, which latter, as artists, we love; giving part of our lives (for Art's sake) to raising our own sheep and cows, catching our own fish, and planting our own corn, even in a wilderness of modern civilization; so keeping our intellects sacred to our Art and to the higher plane, and, like other laborers, dedicating our hands to the raising of our own food, that our bodies may become the stronger and more beautiful vehicles for our souls.

We are without experience, but we are intelligent women and men, not easily daunted, and are ready to study the most advanced methods and experiments, being prepared for failures at the first. If we are artists, we can dare. We will make our lives works of Art; like Hercules, we are ready to perform the labors of life. Though homeless, though countryless, though moneyless, though men naked cast on the earth, we are artists.

We will offer ourselves to the people whose country we shall inhabit, and will be ruled by their laws in force for aliens, living peacefully among them and speaking their language among ourselves. So may we make for ourselves an ark for Art; and when the great nations shall have dashed themselves to pieces on the rocks they have formed around them, we will announce the new age of Spirituality and the Regeneration of the World.

Practical. — As artists, to realize our ideals we must be practical women and men, and a natural mode of life is our first step.

Before the foundation of a colony which is to be the expression of Art and Ideal Life can be laid, a triple union must be established:

I. A union among young idealists, sympathetic by nature, having studied the Art of older nations and having tried to create works as high in inspiration and as perfect in execution and external beauty, though new in poetic form, who know that the power to realize this is a gift from their own Divine

source, whose expression, Art, should be as freely re-given to the world, and not sold any more than Love and Grace can be; those, namely, who are willing to live to execute an Art for Art's sake alone, knowing that Art can never be the product of one man; renouncing egoism, expecting no other reward than the joy of realizing the highest aspiration of their soul, and to this end giving up part of their hours to labor in the fields for their food, which labor has no corruption for the spirit.

II. A union with a mild but energetic climate, having a balance of sunshine, wind, and rain.[1]

III. A union by fraternal sympathy with the people of a country already settled, having an Art future, where the soil shall favor the easy raising of food; with landscape varied by hills, plateaus, woods, and watercourses; not too far inland.[2]

A complete natural and universal scheme by which a man can live for his ideals, free from the struggle against hunger and want, must be a reflection of the idea intended by the Eternal Mind. Such a plan assumes that he shall have enough land at his disposal to meet his simple, natural requirements, as primitive man receives it, together with the sun and the rain, from Nature, — free. To obtain such land in a country having a near Art future, that is, where there is already some enlightenment, necessitates the finding of some one sympathetic to Art, who will provide land ready and cleared for cultivation, and small, simple dwellings, consisting of a room for sleeping, a room for eating, and a studio or study; also a few sheep, cows, and horses, and some farming implements, — enough to start with.

In return for his faith and sympathy, poets, writers, and musicians will dedicate their poems and compositions, and sculptors and painters give their works in trust to him, to be placed in a temple on his land, made for them, to be open at times to his countrymen. Neither he nor his heirs — against whom he should secure us regarding the land — should have any power in our government, nor right to dispose of or

[1] A study of those countries which have produced an Eternal Art, such as Egypt, India, Greece, and Italy, will show that their climates were all the same, — that is, warm but energy-giving.

[2] As Art has rarely ever flourished in two countries in the same era, it is as if we must unite ourselves to the destiny of the place most worthy and favorable to Art.

remove the works we commit to his charge. We and our children shall have no claim on the land or other property; we shall both be bound by the sacred bonds of Art and honor.

Coöperative System. — For every colonist to have as much time daily as possible for the work of his soul, it is imperative to coöperate to produce food with the least labor possible, the labor being divided as equally through the four seasons as may be, the various kinds of work being distributed according to physique, natural preference, experience, and capability. All idea of producing that which can be obtained cheaper outside, or requiring the learning of a trade or the use of expensive machinery, should naturally be abandoned. Our crops and supplies should be limited to our exact needs to live frugally but well. A poet, concentrated on his work for four or five hours, may find more relaxation in the heavy labor of the fields, while a sculptor would perhaps be best suited to lighter work; both would do quickest and easiest that which is most opposite to their higher work.

There are days when the healthy brain-worker, incapacitated for work, could do the labor for another who was profiting by an hour of inspiration, or while his own crops were ripening.

As one man's abstention from his higher work is worth another's, *time* shall become the tender for the colony. Our disdain for money will be sufficient to exclude it from circulation among us. The value of any product shall be reckoned by counting the time spent in its production, and a book shall be kept in which shall be recorded in a peculiar fashion the exact time spent each day over such product, and under each head the date of commencing. A yellow circle (O), symbolizing a day's cycle, from sunrise to sunrise, might represent twenty-four hours; an arc (⌒) one hour, and a point (.) five minutes. Thus, the colonist producing flour shall plant a field of wheat sufficient for one season and sowing for the next, recording the actual time spent each day on the grain, from the time of breaking the soil to the grinding and putting into sacks. The total hours, divided by the amount of flour, will give the value of flour in hours for that season.

A second book might be used to record hours of provision given and received: thus, for three hours of corn, the

colonist shall receive the same number of hours of another commodity, in this way carrying on a system of exchange and cancellation. Also, when one colonist assists another, his hours shall be credited to him.

Meat, Fowls, Milk, Butter, and Eggs. — Pasturing a small flock of sheep and keeping of pigs (which may be butchered outside by a butcher for a small share in the meat), raising of fowls and eggs, care of two cows, their milking and making of butter, would give employment to one or more families.

The Raising of Vegetables, Fruit, and Grain would give employment to a second colonist. The last-named could be ground by a small wind- or water-mill.

Fishing, the Making of Wine, Cider, or Beer, and Washing (by the aid of a small machine) to another; *Cooking, Baking of Bread, Preserving of Fruits, Preparing of Wood for Fuel,* to another; *Printing of Manuscripts, Making of Colors, Repairing of Tools, Carpentering,* etc., to another.

In order to avoid the repetition of cooking and dish-washing in each household, these may be done in a special place built for the purpose, with large oven, etc., situated within easy reach of every family. A large quantity and variety of vegetables, or other simple dishes, may be prepared there, and each colonist can send in his own meat when he requires it, the person in charge attending to the cooking. Dishes may be collected and washed all together by a quick process, and be returned to their owners in a small hand-wagon.[1]

Clothes. — A simple, natural, practical, and ornamental dress can be adopted by the colony; practical as to washing and durability. The cutting and sewing by machines of such costumes, as well as repairing, may be undertaken by one or more colonists, who would prefer such work to outdoor labor.

We shall be within easy communication with a doctor in case of need. With the simple, ready medicines and the experience of those among us, we shall be able to provide for any accident or emergency.

Résumé. — By returning to a simple, natural life; by wisely-disposed labor, equally distributed throughout the seasons, we can easily earn our simple, natural bread. Such

[1] Such ideas will be, of course, open to discussion and experiment.

sustained muscular activity as is necessary for the continued equilibrium of a great ideal worker to produce works of power and intellectual brawn (which is now the common need) will be enough to earn for him this bread and his liberty. Like the birds, not laying up food in barns, he would be free to follow the flights of his soul. The man and woman who go out to the fields, after hours of concentrated brain work, will be refreshed by the change of work, rather than fatigued. Such a régime means untiring activity, and Art.

Even those whom fortune has placed beyond the necessity of earning their bread, will know a nobler manhood for so doing, and will lessen the difficulties of the others by increasing the number of workers. Everyone who makes his own life a heroism strengthens his Art. Only a vigorous life and body can know and create a vigorous, lasting Art.

Our fields will be adjoining, our houses set within them; we shall have no walls nor streets, no barriers of civilization between us. Our gatherings will be on the sward in the shade of circling trees, to sing our poems and our praise. Here we shall recount the labors of the day; we shall become as the heroes of our works.

The painter and the sculptor will have a habitation for their works in a temple of their own conception; the musician and the poet will there give their own compositions and dramas. The poet will have his works translated and printed for his brothers and for the country of his adoption. The earth will be to us a more harmonious creating-place, where we may unite in one voice of praise to the Supreme Creator who has chosen us as his imitators.

Abiding by the laws of the country and governed among ourselves by Art, Fraternity, and Forbearance, ever crushing down selfhood within us, we should ride over many of the complications of life and bring nearer the realization of our ideals.

As the rays of the seven colors unite and form white, so, by the exchange of ideas and an amalgamation of the fittest of passing nations, we shall bring back an Art of eternal ideas born of Divine Inspiration and clothed in forms of pure intellectual beauty and of translucent imagination.

Subject to the laws of evolution bringing the downfall of commerce, the people of our adopted country will be raised to a union with Art, thus laying the foundation of a new faith

and civilization, where wisdom reigns and erects monuments of beauty, and where the artist is priest.

"If I be lifted up I will draw all men unto me."

Government. — Every artist shall have perfect liberty for his own ideas of Art, his religious belief or opinions, and in his domestic life. But as a colonist he shall be governed by *Three Primordial Ideas*, by the recognition of which any artist can claim the right to *apply* for admission to the colony. These shall be the *unchanging* rulers of the colony, *without which it does not exist.*

I. To unite to create, individually and jointly, an Art for Art's sake, which is to express the highest aspiration of his soul, renouncing all egoism and distinction.

II. To devote part of the day to manual labor, so as to become self-supporting.

III. To crush down all selfishness, jealousy, envy, malice, and discord, and to live as far as possible the noble life of an artist.

Every artist should uphold the colony flag symbolic of these three ideas, which is to plant the symbol of Art in the land. A border of appropriate design and color, or an emblem, may be worn as a decoration on some part of the dress adopted by him.

All questions and controversies shall be considered as belonging to one of two planes, to be decided accordingly. The first shall be the highest plane and of the soul. Matters of Art, Sentiment, Charity, Support of the Sick and Infirm, Education of Children, etc., shall be settled in this plane without debate, the colonist writing his pure and unselfish opinion, free from malice, and unsigned, as an address to the *highest and most sacred idea* he knows, depositing it to be read by the others and settled by silent vote. The Three Ideas shall rule this plane. All matters concerning manual labor, economy, exchange, etc., shall be settled by discussion and vote. The First Plane shall have the rule over this.

The musician, painter, poet, or sculptor, although free to carry out his own ideals of Art, has no right to give out any work or monument outside of his own house, that is, on colony commons, without the consent of the entire colony, the refusal of one person sufficing as a veto. That which is once given for the colony cannot be removed by him, neither

can it be removed against his will, unless by the desire of all the rest. All should be united in the choosing of the position occupied by any work, or in the desire for the representation of any musical composition or drama.

The quarrels and disputes of inartistic men do not apply to us. Although, as artists, our differences of opinion may be strong, the purity of our motives and our unselfish love of Art will reconcile them.

Women. — There shall be a perfect equality between women and men, and women shall have a voice in all matters (as souls; the colonists have no sex). A wife shall feel herself an independent self-supporting artist, choosing a manual occupation adapted to her physical strength, not depending on her husband; nor should he impose upon her the never-accounted-for small duties of the household. If she have full care of the children, the support of the entire family would devolve upon the husband.

Children. — Children shall be at the expense and care of their parents until such time as they shall be old enough to be responsible and do real labor for their own food and clothing, and to record hours in so doing. As young children they may go to the fields with their parents, to help them as much as they are capable of, the parents instructing them in practical farming. As soon as they show an inclination to study or follow the calling of any colonist, that colonist shall receive them fraternally at certain times as pupils, and impart to them his knowledge if they prove themselves worthy. And so shall our children help on Art and our labors. Such children, growing up naturally, with the idea of being self-supporting and free to follow their own aspirations, would become strong, simple, Art-loving souls. Every artist knows the mistakes and sufferings of his childhood, when forced to work and learn without an ideal in view, pampered and spoiled by reliance on parents who would make of him a small copy of themselves; raised to prudence and commercial nonentity, at last breaking away to follow the promptings of his own soul, which he wished to do from the first. The first principles of mathematics could be given to the child at the school of the district. The children could, if they chose, study subjects of their own fancy from books at hand, and form their own education by their own efforts and the aid of their masters, being free to go from the colony

and seek other experiences if they choose. If they do not desire to become artists, as mere bread-laborers they shall have no right to occupy colony houses, but shall belong to the household of their parents until they are old enough to go elsewhere. They shall have no claim by right of birth to the house and land occupied by their parents, nor to their works of Art, except what may be their parents' private work, wealth, and possessions, which do not concern the colony in any way.

Servants. — Such colonists as have private means are free to hire servants for their household or to care for their children, but never to supplant them in their work in the fields; and no houses shall be built for such or other outsiders.

Models and workmen for sculptors and painters shall be at the latter's private expense.

Every colonist or family shall have a house alone, if he or they so desire; the Art Befriender would only be expected to supply a simple dwelling. All other accommodation, for servants, etc., as well as their keep, shall be at the private expense of the colonist. The idea is to maintain small farms which shall form altogether one large one, for those who have done with the luxury of civilization.

Fund. — It will perhaps be necessary for each to raise a trifle more than enough for actual consumption, against old age, sickness, losses, charities, repairs, and outside-colony expenses. All such surplus shall be deposited by each colonist; and if it be found that anyone has contributed more than his share it shall be returned to him in hours.

All surplus of perishable produce, such as eggs, vegetables, etc., may be taken to the nearest town and sold at the prevailing prices; and such necessaries as oil, sugar, medicines, tea, and coffee can be bought with the money and retailed to the others at cost in hours.

Painters and sculptors requiring material other than that which can be produced in the colony, if they have no private means, will be obliged to raise extra produce to procure the same. An artist shall expect no pecuniary help from the colony in the execution of his works, unless it be the united wish of the colony.

Amendments. — Only a unanimous vote can make amendments to existing laws (excepting the Three Ideas) or make new ones.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR OF THE ARENA.

The foregoing "Appeal" was sent to us from Paris accompanied by a letter, from which the following is an extract:

PARIS, 14 November, 1896.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ARENA:

DEAR SIR, — I have the honor to represent a body of artists sending you the manuscript composed by them, which they feel you will be pleased to publish for them in your review, believing the latter to be the most sympathetic to such an ideal movement, and that among your readers in America they will awaken the most interest.

. . . . . .

J. M. DURAND.
203 Boulevard Raspail, Paris.

A more recent letter states that the Society is now organized, and that it includes one practical farmer among its members. Any person desiring to receive more particular information of this Artists' Colony, with the idea of coöperating with its members, will be put in communication with them or their correspondent for America on sending his letter to the care of the Editor of THE ARENA. The progress of this remarkable socialistic experiment will doubtless be watched with sympathetic interest by the whole civilized world.

THE ARMENIAN REFUGEES.

By M. H. GULESIAN.

"Might I choose from the world where my dwelling should be,
I would say, still thy ruins are Eden to me,
My beloved Armenia."

THE Constantinople massacre brought the horrors perpetrated by the Turks upon their defenceless victims nearer home to Europeans and Americans than the number of nearly one hundred thousand innocent people in the interior of Turkey had ever done; for, during this massacre, thousands were able to escape by means of the foreign legations and by the foreign steamers anchored in the harbor. And the sight of these fleeing men, women, and children, at the very point of the Turkish bayonet, has brought a realizing sense of the condition of affairs existing in Turkey, even to the most sceptical. It is estimated that, of those who escaped during this massacre, twelve thousand went to Bulgaria, about one thousand to Alexandria, Egypt, about eight hundred to Greece, a few hundred to Marseilles, France, and various numbers to other countries. The graphic accounts given in the papers of the destitute condition of the poor exiles at Marseilles so stirred the kind hearts of Miss Frances E. Willard and Lady Henry Somerset, those noble women who are always ready to extend a helping hand, that they resolved to go at once to Marseilles to see what personal aid they could render. Miss Willard speaks of the scene which met their eyes as one of unspeakable pathos. She describes the men from all ranks and conditions as being huddled together on bare benches, utterly destitute and forlorn, with bread and water only for food, and a board to sleep on, in the dead and poisonous air of the great barnlike place in which they had found shelter. It will readily be seen that there was plenty of work for these noble women to do, and they performed it almost miraculously. In a short time they had so transformed the place as to make it fairly comfortable, and they then turned their attention to the task of making arrangements by which many of the refugees could be sent to the United States. After some difficulties, arrangements were made, and soon about four hundred were put on board steamers bound for

1. M. H. GULESIAN, Manufacturer, Boston.
2. MARGARET ALICE GULESIAN, daughter of M. H. GULESIAN.
3. MISS M. B. BOULGOUJOO, Armenian lady.
4. DR. OHAN GAIDSARKIAN, from Adana.
5. PROF. A. M. IGNADOSSIAN, Professor of the Armenian Language at Aintab.

the United States, with happy hearts that they would now, so soon, reach the long-desired land of freedom. But alas! the bitter disappointment that awaited them here. On arriving at Ellis Island they were detained two weeks, and told that they were to be returned to Turkey. After waiting anxiously for more than two weeks, every day expecting their release, I went to New York to interview the emigration commissioner. I had with me letters guaranteeing positions for about fifty, and these I presented to Dr. Senner, hoping he would be able to release that number at any rate; and although he pointed out most courteously that he could not grant my request, he yet gave me the satisfaction of saying that they should not be returned to Turkey.

After finishing my interview with Dr. Senner, in which I told him that it would be more humane to drown them in New York harbor than to return them to Turkey, I went to the pen where they were detained, and found a most forlorn and abject-looking set, believing that they were to be sent back to Turkey, or finally disposed of in the harbor. After making it known to them that I was one of their countrymen, and had come from Boston to look after them, they crowded up to the iron fence and begged me to do all I could to get them out of that place. They said they had heard talk of sending them back to Turkey, and did not feel sure but that the Turks were compelling the United States to send them back, the thought of which was terrorizing. They spoke in such a discouraged way of the uncertainty of their fate, when they thought they had finally entered a free country, that it could not but touch me to the heart. I talked with them for half an hour, assuring them that they would not be returned to Turkey under any circumstances. One thing that made my blood boil more than anything else during this detention of the refugees was the tyranny exercised by the petty officials, and the abusive language used both to the refugees and to me, in regard to landing the refugees, when it required my strictest attention to understand their broken language, and I could not help wondering how long it was since they themselves had crossed the ocean. In thinking over the whole transaction, I came to the conclusion that the intention of the immigration bureau was to make it as costly as possible, especially to the steamship companies, so as not to make it profitable for them to bring any more refugees over. They did not realize that

these men were not paupers, or immigrants in the usual meaning that word suggests, but that they were refugees, who had fled here because their lives were in jeopardy in their own country. The bond of $500 each, required by law, was finally reduced to $100, and by that time a gentleman of New York gave bonds for $25,000, which procured the release of all. While these men were being thus detained, thousands of the refuse of Europe landed without any trouble.

After their release, the different organizations and individuals that had agreed to be responsible for a certain number took them to the different places prepared for them.

This distribution was effected by the Salvation Army, the Armenian Relief Association, and Dr. Ayvazian of New York. Of those sent to Boston, forty-seven were sent to the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and forty-two to Miss Blackwell, each of whom had agreed to be responsible for a certain number, though not for so large a number as were sent. Others came in small detachments at various times. A temporary shelter was offered in Revere by a gentleman, for the Woman's Christian Temperance Union to use for the accommodation of those in their charge, and I offered to Miss Blackwell the use of one of the floors in my factory. I then made it my chief work to make these poor people as comfortable as I could, and to make the place as homelike as possible during their short stay, while awaiting situations. I divided the room by a large curtain into two divisions, using one part for the sleeping-room, and the other for a living room. By a free use of flags and bunting in the American and Armenian colors, we made the room quite attractive.

Beds and bedding were freely contributed by many kind friends. Then I began my first experience in housekeeping, which I found quite exciting. Finding three rooms near the factory, suitable for kitchen, dining-room, and storeroom, I hired them. I then bought a stove, all necessary kitchen utensils, tables, tableware, chairs, etc. I also succeeded in procuring an Armenian cook, who made good Armenian bread and other native dishes.

On the arrival of each detachment they were met by Mrs. Samuel J. Barrows, Miss Blackwell, and myself. They were then conducted to 16 Waltham Street, where a warm breakfast was served them. We owe a great deal to the above-mentioned ladies, as well as to Mrs. Fessenden and Mrs. Baker of

the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Soon we had an organized systematic way of conducting the place. After a few days' trial, it was found necessary to transfer the men at Revere to Waltham Street, although they still continued under the charge of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Revere being found too distant, and too much time being taken in going back and forth to look after them.

When this transfer was made, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union paid twenty-five cents a day per head for their food. The refugees were mostly men, though some women and children were among them, and they told me that during the two months' journey, they had not had a change of clothing, or any food they could relish.

When their board and lodging had been arranged for, I felt it most important that they should learn as much English as possible while with me, and begin to learn American manners and customs. Several ladies kindly volunteered to come and teach, and four or five classes were taught every morning from 9 to 11.30.

In the evening they attended the evening school near by, and once, sometimes twice, a day, I talked to them on American customs and manners. Within a few weeks they had made great progress. They were all most eager to find some work by which they could support themselves. It has been observed by every visitor to the home that these men were bright, intelligent-looking, and in some instances highly educated, speaking three to six languages. Though these men were born in Asia and brought up under a less than half-civilized government, yet their intelligence and moral character surpasses the average foreigner from Europe who comes to this country. Nothing would have brought them here but to escape the massacre. Many of them had a profitable business and a happy home; and when they tell of these ruined homes, and of the killing and torture of their relatives and friends, it is too pitiable to listen to.

Soon after their arrival I was distributing some of the clothing which had been sent in, and I noticed a number of them with tears rolling down their cheeks. I stopped and inquired what the trouble was, and they told me of the destruction of their property and all their life's earnings, and said that three months ago they had a prosperous business, bright firesides, and happy homes, and now they were accepting clothing

given in charity. The sad faces and tears of these strong men moved my already long pent-up feelings, so that I was unable to go on with the work of distribution.

The stories of nearly all were such as to make one weep as they would speak so sorrowfully and affectionately of a father or mother, wife or children. They did not know where these were, whether among the living or dead, whether captives in Turkish harems or sick and penniless and left to starve. Every day one or another would come to me, begging to know if there was not some way in which they could find out about their dear ones.

One of the saddest sights I ever witnessed was that of one of the refugees, a promising young man of eighteen, for whom work had been obtained in Brighton, but who after two weeks was taken seriously ill, and had to be taken to the City Hospital. When on his deathbed, he expressed a desire to see me, and I immediately went to see what I could do for him. During our conversation I asked him if he could give me any clew to his parents, that I might send them word, and he began to sob, and said: "I cannot tell; they ran one way and I another. I do not know whether they are alive or dead." He had since heard that they were believed to be in Alexandria, Egypt, but the uncertainty of their fate and condition was terrible. He said he could die easier if he were only sure that his mother was safe and unharmed. As I thought this case over, and reflected that this was only one of thousands, the discouraging thought came to me, "Can God be living?"

Another picture that oft rises before me in this dreadful drama that is being enacted is that of the old men, a large number of whom have been exiled — men who had held high and influential positions among their people, who were looked up to with admiration and almost with reverence for their many acts of kindness, charity, and devotion to their people. Nearly all of this class who have not been killed are now exiles, and I have met many of them in this country, friendless, homeless, and penniless. They have already once nobly performed life's mission, and now they are suddenly bereft of everything, with youth, strength, and ambition gone. The picture is too sad to dwell upon.

Alas, ye poor Armenians!
In undeserved distress
Ye wander forth to slavery,
In want and wretchedness.

A myriad woes ye suffered,
  Nor left your own dear home;
But now ye leave your fathers' graves
  In distant lands to roam.

These waters sweet, these smiling fields,
  Where cities fair are set,
To strangers ye abandon them,
  But how can ye forget?

Nay, while you live, remember;
  Be to your country true;
Your children and descendants,
  Bid them remember too.

The holy name of Ararat
  And many a sacred fane,
Till the last judgment wakes the world
  Shall in their hearts remain.

Alas for thee, my country!
  Alas for thee, for us!
I would that death had sealed mine eyes
  Ere I beheld thee thus![1]

Then I think how all these sad scenes, and all the butchery, starvation, and martyrdom of the last three years, all the suffering, — suffering so terrible that even that of the Apostles cannot be compared to it, or even the physical suffering of Christ, — all might have been averted if they would have surrendered their faith. Yet all was endured for the sake of The Christ.

During the stay of the refugees at the temporary home, services were held every Sunday, much to the pleasure of the refugees, who greatly enjoyed them. They were also participated in by many American friends and Armenian residents of Boston. Different ministers were invited to speak to them every Sunday. At the third service, the minister came without his Bible. When he asked me for one, I said I had not provided any, as each minister had brought his own with him. As he seemed at a loss to proceed without one, the thought came to me that there might be one among the boys. So I stepped behind the curtain, where some twenty were assembled, ready for the opening of the service, and asked if any of them had a Bible. Whereupon eighteen out of the twenty

[1] Translation of an Armenian poem.

replied that they had, and started for their scanty little bundles. They had hardly been able to take anything with them, and yet they had not forgotten to take their Bibles. The Rev. Edward Bliss, in his recent book on "Turkey and the Armenian Atrocities," says, in speaking of the Armenians: "They cherish the Bible as the most precious of their possessions, and guard it all the more sacredly when to do so involves the hazard of their lives."

In considering the average refugee, the young and middle-aged, it is wonderful to see how bravely they bear their heavy burdens, and how courageous they are in regard to the future. The following case is an instance: One of the young men whose picture I have in a refugee group, had a fine dry-goods store, and was doing a most prosperous business. When the massacre began, he hurriedly gathered up what cash he could, closed the store, and ran for his life. He intended running to one of the legations, but the Turks were gaining on him so rapidly that he ran into the house of a Greek near by, and was hidden. After hiding for forty-eight hours, and when the massacre had ceased, he went out, disguising himself all he could, to see what had happened to his store. He found the store broken into, and not a thing left. Even the old broom he had used to sweep the floor was gone. He calls himself fortunate, however, as he recalls the terrible fate that befell many of his friends and neighbors, who lost their lives or suffered bodily injury, as well as losing all the property they had. Now, when I go up to the room given up to them, with a letter in my hand, or some one with me, they know that there is a chance for one of them, and they all come to the front eager to go. We have succeeded in getting places for all of them, — 123 *in toto*. Wherever they have had a trade we have endeavored to place them in the same, and have in all cases tried to adapt the men to the work offered, as far as possible. We have sent men as civil engineers, carpenters, masons, cobblers, barbers, blacksmiths, to shoe factories, to cordage factories, to farms, for housework, and other occupations. Two have been placed in schools. We have had many gratifying letters from the people where we have placed them.

The happiest feature of their stay while at Waltham Street was that of the Thanksgiving dinner, when all Armenians were invited to the feast, and 225 availed themselves of the

THANKSGIVING DINNER GIVEN BY MR. M. H. GULESIAN TO ARMENIAN REFUGEES,

At the Temporary Home in Boston, Mass., Nov. 26, 1896.

invitation. Many Armenian ladies and children were among them.

What impressed me strongly, as well as others, was the character and behavior of these 123 men while they were with me. Realizing the restraint under which they had been kept all their lives, especially since the massacre, I made up my mind to give them as much liberty as possible, so that they might know what freedom was like. So I opened wide the door, regardless of religious creeds, and it was left wide open during all their stay for them to go out and in as they pleased. Not once was this kindness taken advantage of, and from the beginning to the end of the sixty-two days, during which they were with me, none of them indulged themselves in intoxicating drinks or in any other improper way, although they had to pass two bar-rooms every time they went out. Many of them even gave up smoking when I told them the disadvantage they would labor under in working for Americans.

In their home life, the Armenians are a most affectionate, home-loving people. Their family relations are held most sacred. When the sons marry, they bring their wives back to the old homestead. Thus, sometimes there are three or four families residing under one roof, yet there is seldom any quarrelling or jealousy. They are naturally a moral people, and divorce is a thing almost unknown. As old as our history is, dating back to Haig the great-great-grandson of Noah, polygamy and slavery are also unknown.

Two questions are continually being asked me: "How do any of the Armenians get out of Turkey?" and "Why don't they all come out?" It must be remembered that most of those who do succeed in getting here are from cities on or near the sea-coast. To get out of the interior is a much more difficult matter.

I will relate one instance which concerns myself personally, and will serve to show why more Armenians do not leave Turkey. The instance is that of my youngest brother, who, by a fortunate circumstance, saved not only his own life, but that of his parents also, in that third and most terrible massacre, which overran Marash. While sitting on the wall enclosing the house, talking with a Turkish boy of his own age, he saw a large band of Turks and soldiers bent on plunder, pillage, and murder, approaching the house. This Turkish boy, out of the friendship he had for my brother,

and at his entreaties, jumped up and ran to them, begging them to go away, and assuring them that a previous party had been there and stripped the house of everything. Although this was not true, it served the desired purpose, and as he was the son of a well-known and influential Turk, they probably believed him, or else did not care to waste time in finding out, as there were plenty of other houses which they could as well plunder, and to which they immediately turned their attention. After this massacre was over, I sent a hundred dollars for this brother to come over here with. Of course, the first thing to do was to get a passport from the Turkish Government, which is a very difficult thing to do, and is only done by bribing the Turkish officials. Thirty dollars of this money had to go to secure his passport. He started on a pack-horse, with a caravan, each man carrying his own food and bedding, as there are no hotels or inns in the interior. He passed safely through the small villages, but when he came to the city of Adana he was arrested at once and put in prison. But by bribing some of the minor officials, and through the influence of some friends he had in the city, he was released, and he took the train from Adana to Mersin, at which place he was to take the steamer. As soon as he got out of the train, however, he was at once recaptured, and after a day's imprisonment at Mersin, he was sent to Tarsus for examination, and from there taken back to Adana, which is the capital of the vilayet. There he was put in prison again, without any trial, in a place not fit for the worst criminals. At the expiration of three weeks, influence of friends and more bribing got him out again, and this time, avoiding the train, he succeeded in getting to Mersin. Here he bought his ticket for Marseilles, and had just money enough left to bribe one more man to row him in his own boat out to the steamer. So he, too, like most of the other refugees, landed at Marseilles penniless and friendless. This is not an extreme case, but represents fairly the difficulties encountered by the average comer.

Some travellers and writers, here and in England, have misrepresented Armenians, not taking into consideration the woful circumstances by which they are surrounded. Some have called them sharpers, others cheats and liars, which I claim is a misrepresentation of the true inner character of the Armenian. I can see how these characteristics have im-

pressed themselves upon travellers, who only see Armenians amid the Eastern customs. For instance, if a storekeeper in the East does not ask for an article three times as much as it is worth, he might just as well give up business, as the buyer never expects to pay more than a third of the price asked. I would like to emphasize particularly that there is no chance while living in Turkey to learn anything different. Having for many centuries been at the mercy of the rapacious Turkish officials, who have had a perfect right to extort all they could from the Armenians, no matter how unjustly, they have had to learn in self-defence to evade and deceive, or they could not have retained for themselves enough to live upon. Nearly every example that is set them by the Turkish officials is one of dishonesty and corruption, so the Armenians have had to meet Turkish rapacity with Armenian cunning. But if these traits have been observed in some cases, I claim that they are not in our blood, but in our bringing up. They have been cultivated for self-protection. Men who write thus blindly forget that there is nothing in Turkey to develop honesty or trust in one another. On the other hand, there is every reason why we should become corrupt and demoralized. From time immemorial it has been the aim of the Turkish Government to set the Christian races one against the other, to break up all union, fellowship, and patriotism; and to that end it has used all its skill. The Turkish Government is so full of bribery and corruption that the whole population has become infected. I venture to say that to-day, if you were to take the children of the wisest and best families of America and England, and put them in the places of the Armenians of Turkey, they will grow up the same. In Armenia the degree of education is most limited; there are no books or magazines, lectures or newspapers. These things which are for the development of mankind are forbidden.

Some people have said that Armenians could never learn to govern themselves, as they would not agree, and could not bear to have one superior to the rest. I am now more than ever convinced that that is a false assertion, and one that can be positively denied. I have pushed certain points to the extreme to test this, by appointing one over the others in various ways, and am absolutely convinced that Armenians can work together as well as any nationality on earth. All they need is to be sure that there is no selfish interest in those

leading them. Naturally, of course, they expect that there is some underlying selfish motive in every measure proposed, as that has been their experience in nine cases out of ten under Turkish rule.

If the chance were given and the yoke of the Turk removed, these writers would find that they were as mistaken as those were who, before the massacre, said that the Armenian Church and religion were more a religion of form and ceremony than anything else, and lacked the essential elements of Christianity. When the test came, they found out that the devotion of Armenians to the Christian religion was unequalled by the people of the Western world at any age. So, with our national affairs, if the chance were offered I am sure there are hundreds if not thousands of Armenians who would be found ready to sacrifice not only self-interest, but even life itself, in order to secure the unity of our people. Where Armenians have been given the chance to learn better things, how quickly they have raised themselves to the standard set them by civilization!

It may be interesting to the public to know what kind of citizens Armenians make in this country. They have proved to be sober, industrious, zealous in helping one another, and faithful. As mechanics they rank as high as those of any nationality; they have good business ability. Two years ago, when I made inquiries, I found there were none confined in the different penal and charitable institutions of this State. Now there are about four thousand Armenians in this State, and according to personal letters which I received this last week from the various wardens and superintendents of these institutions, there were only two confined in them all. At Long Island, where that immense institution is full of paupers, Dr. Cogswell says in his letter that he has never known of any Armenians being under his charge. When it is taken into consideration that these four thousand men in the State of Massachusetts are for the most part here without their wives or any family ties, and that the young men are destitute of any sort of family connections, it will be seen that they are laboring under tremendous disadvantages and hardships which no other nationality has to struggle under. It may be well in closing to refer once more to the Rev. Mr. Bliss, who says, "Those who know the race most widely and most intimately, esteem it the most highly."

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION.

By PROF. FRANK PARSONS.

STRIKES are a serious injury to the public, cause enormous losses to employers and employees, and often accomplish nothing for the strikers beyond blacklisting and the loss of opportunity to earn a living. What is the remedy? Coöperation will abolish strikes, because employers, as a separate class antagonistic to labor, will disappear, and the workers will become their own employers. But coöperation does not promise any immediate relief; it is growing very slowly, and cannot be relied on as a present solution. Aside from coöperation, the equitable methods of avoiding strikes are two: *voluntary settlement* by conciliation or mediation;[1] and *compulsory settlement* in courts having jurisdiction of industrial questions under statutory regulations of labor and capital, or under the general principles of justice and equity.

Since voluntary methods do not accomplish the work, and there is no immediate prospect of their doing so, it is clear that at present and probably for this generation the question is simply, *strikes* or *labor courts*. Let us examine the leading arguments that may be advanced on each side of the question.

1. Where mediation and conciliation fail, compulsory arbitration is demanded in the interests of *peace*, — industrial, political, and social peace. Violence and destruction are frequent accompaniments of strikes. Here are a few of the facts:[2]

Massachusetts railroad strike, 1834; riots, militia called out to suppress the disturbance.

Philadelphia weavers, 1842; very disorderly.

[1] For an account of conciliation and voluntary arbitration see Price on "Industrial Peace," Macmillan, 1887; Jeans on "Conciliation and Arbitration," London, 1894; Lowell on "Industrial Arbitration and Conciliation," Putnam's Sons, 1893; and the writings of North and Carroll D. Wright. For certain industries in certain localities voluntary methods have been made to do good work, but, as the record of strikes only too clearly shows, there is a large field in which such methods do not yet suffice.

[2] See Reports of U. S. Commissioner of Labor, 1887 and 1894; House Report 4174, 49th Congress, 2d session.

Philadelphia brickmakers, 1843; much rioting and destruction of property.

Great railroad strike, 1877; rioting and burning, troops overpowered by mobs, twelve men killed at Baltimore and many more at Pittsburg, millions of property destroyed.

Gould railroad strike, 1886; violence and destruction.

New York street-car strike, 1889; riotous conduct, one striker shot.

Buffalo strike, 1892; riots, troops, bloodshed, entire State militia called out.

Homestead strike, 1892; riots, Pinkerton's battle, many lives lost, much property destroyed, forty non-union men poisoned at their meals.

Coal Creek Valley miners' strike, Tennessee, 1892; fighting and burning, State troops called out.

Silk workers' strike, Paterson, N. J., 1894; rioting and mob violence.

Great coal miners' strike in eleven States and one Territory, 1894; whole counties terrorized, strikers intrenched in open insurrection, much property destroyed, troops powerless to preserve order, shooting, eviction, dynamite assassination, kidnapping, torture, pitched battles, many lives lost.

Chicago strike, 1894; mobs, riots, troops, loss of life and property.

Brooklyn street-car strike, 1895; rioting and destruction.

Philadelphia street-car strike, 1895; some disturbance and destruction.

One of the objects of the Federal Constitution is to "insure domestic tranquillity." Surely that object cannot be considered accomplished until law is substituted for force in the settlement of labor troubles. Even where rioting does not occur, the danger of violence that is incident to every great industrial dispute is in itself a mighty influence for evil. If the parties will not voluntarily adopt a method of settlement that does not threaten the public peace, they must be compelled to adopt it. The public good is the supreme law.

2. *Justice* demands that law be substituted for force as a means of deciding labor troubles, not merely for the sake of peace and safety, protection of life and property, and securing the business of the community from interruption or hindrance, but also for the sake of fairer and more reasonable settlements between the parties, and the infusion of equity into all the relations of labor and capital.

Very often the claims of workmen who strike are wholly

just, and few cases can be found in which their claims were not just in part at the least. Almost always there is a real grievance that ought to be redressed, yet in the majority of cases the strikers are defeated, and fail to obtain relief; not uncommonly indeed they are severely punished for venturing to ask for justice, all who were known to have been active in the strike being discharged and blacklisted, and the rest being less favorably treated than before the strike, to teach them to be quiet in future, and very likely discharged on the slightest pretext and replaced by non-union men.

The Pullman affair is a good illustration of the failure of strikes to secure justice for the workers. The demands of the men were for the most part fair and reasonable; public sympathy was with them; their cause was backed by a tremendous sympathetic strike on the railways; yet the struggle brought them no redress, nothing but loss.

At the time of the Philadelphia street-car strike in 1895, the men were working twelve to fourteen hours a day for $2, were unprotected from the weather, and were refused recogtion as an organization. They struck for a ten-hour day, vestibules, and recognition. Public sympathy was all on their side. Every paper in the city espoused their cause, except one, which was controlled by Traction interests. Immense meetings of citizens were held, and committees of prominent men were appointed to intercede with the companies. Yet the strike entirely failed to secure the workers anything but loss, discharge, and blacklisting.

The recent strike of conductors and motormen in Boston is another illustration of the ineffectiveness of strikes. The men were being worked over ten hours a day in violation of law, they were subject to arbitrary discharge at the whim of any petty boss, and in case of accident were laid off one, two, three, sometimes seven or eight days during the investigation of the matter, and were obliged to lose this time whether they proved faultless in respect to the accident or not. The demand of the men for better treatment in these respects was eminently just, and the public approved their cause, but they failed to obtain relief. The strike was not well managed, but, judging by experience in Philadelphia and other cities, it is very improbable that the men would have secured their rights even if they had conducted the battle with all possible skill.

The terrible Coal Creek Valley strike was a revolt against

the employment of convict labor in the mines. The strikers were conquered by the troops and gained no recognition of the very just demand that the practice of farming out prisoners to corporations should cease. The strike did something however toward bringing the Tennessee system into disrepute.

One of the demands of the telegraphers' strike of 1883 was that women should receive the same pay as men for the same work. Another was for the abolition of Sunday work without extra pay; and another for an eight-hour day. The strike failed, and these just demands were not complied with.

The record of strikes by no means covers the field of injustice to labor; in innumerable cases the workers suffer in silence, knowing the costliness and futility of strikes. In many of these cases redress might very likely be obtained if a peaceful appeal to a court of justice were permitted.

Let sixty per cent of the workers affected by any grievance have the right to bring the matter into court on showing that reasonable effort in the direction of conciliation and voluntary arbitration has been made and has failed to afford redress. If either employers or employed do not desire to leave the decision with the court, let the workers choose one arbitrator, the employers another, and these two a third, subject to the approval of the court, (which represents the interests of the community;) let the award of this board of arbitrators stand on the same footing as a judgment of the court and be enforced in the same way. Do this and make strikes unlawful, and you have gone a great way toward substituting reason for might in deciding the rights of labor and capital.

Not only the workers and the general public would be benefited, but there would be a corresponding gain to capital, which is also a heavy loser by strikes, and does at times submit to imposition and grant unjust demands rather than risk the consequences of a rupture. This is especially apt to be so where employees take advantage of the fact that their employers are under contract with third persons to perform a given service in a specified time.

In whatever way it is regarded, judgment by court is a better means of arriving at justice and equity than judgment by wager of battle. In respect to justice the decision of an impartial tribunal will have the same superiority over private settlement by conflict in the case of disputes between corporations and their employees as in case of disputes between

man and man, or State and State. Heat and passion, greed and strength, are not the champions of equity. The prize ring does not concern itself with right. The battlefield is not the place to look for justice.

The Federal Constitution reflects the thought and experience of the civilized world in the statement that the first object of government is "to establish justice." Surely governments instituted to establish justice should endeavor to prevent the continuance of anything so inimical to justice as the strike. And if society takes from labor what is often to-day its sole defence against capitalistic aggression, — if society forbids the strike, as indeed it does already through the injunctions of its Federal courts whenever the combat threatens to hinder the mails or interfere with interstate commerce, — then it is surely the duty of society to give to labor another means of defence as good or better than the one that is taken away; and the only method of doing this at the present stage of social development is to establish industrial arbitration, with the power of the law behind it to enforce whatever decisions may be rendered.

3. *Economy* demands the arbitrament of law in place of the arbitrament of conflict. In the railway strike of 1877 the loss to property and business inflicted by the mob at Pittsburg alone is estimated at $5,000,000, and the county of Allegheny was compelled to pay $2,787,000 of the loss sustained during the Pittsburg riots. The Chicago strike cost the railways $5,358,000, and the employees $1,700,000, a total of $7,058,000, not including the loss to the Pullman Company. The National Commission says that "beyond these amounts very great losses, widely distributed, were incidentally suffered throughout the country." The California fruit-growers, for example, lost $50,000 a day. The total loss which resulted from that one strike, in all probability exceeded $10,000,000. The telegraph strike of 1883 cost the companies $909,000, and the men $250,000. The railway strike on the "Gould system" in 1886 cost the strikers $900,000, those thrown out of employment by their action, $500,000, and the railroads, $3,180,000.

For the strikes that occurred from 1881 to 1886, inclusive, the wage loss by employees is estimated by the United States Commissioner of Labor at $51,814,000, and the employers' losses are estimated by the same authority at

$30,701,000.[1] And the trouble is not growing less as the years go by. From 1741 to 1880, inclusive, there were 1,491 strikes and lockouts, while for the six years ending December 31, 1886, the number of strikes alone was 3,902, — forty a year for the first period, and over six hundred and fifty a year for the second. Making all due allowance for fuller reporting of strikes in the later period, the contrast is still a startling one.

Surely it is cheaper as well as more just to settle by court than by strike. At present we pay for the strike first; then we pay for a commission to examine into its causes and results; let us have the inquiry first, and save the expense of the strike.

4. *Manhood* also demands arbitration instead of war. Conflict debases both the victor and the victim. Every time deliberation is substituted for passion and force, a gain for character-development is made.

5. It will modify and limit the despotic power of unscrupulous corporations, and so tend to prevent oppression, ameliorate the condition of labor, and secure a better diffusion of wealth.

6. It will tend to secure the stability of our republic and the perpetuity of free institutions, by effecting greater harmony in the relations of employers and employed, and eliminating some of the injustices, antagonisms, and conflicts that cause the development of dangerous animosities between labor and capital, and feed the growth of anarchy.

7. *The argument from history and the trend of civilization.* The tendency of advancing civilization is all in the direction of substituting the compulsion of courts of justice for the private compulsion of individuals or groups of individuals. In primitive times the settlement of disputes of every sort was a private matter. If one man wronged another, or a disagreement arose as to rights, the parties fought out the difficulty alone, or with such help as their friends might grant. Men early found that this method did not insure justice and was inimical to the public peace, so they established courts of justice, with power to compel the arbitration of disputes, in order that their decisions might be by cool, impartial intelligence, instead of by heat and passion, strength and cunning.

[1] Report of U. S. Commissioner of Labor, 1887, p. 28.

We compel the arbitration of disputes between man and man, between State and State, between individuals and States, and we are about to establish a court of arbitration for the settlement of disputes between nation and nation, but disputes between a corporation and its employees are left to the primitive method of barbaric conflict.

Under the treaty between the United States and Great Britain, we are trying to do away with war between nation and nation by creating an International Court of Arbitration. When the chief nations of the world come into the movement, send their representatives, and stand behind its decrees, we shall have compulsory arbitration of national difficulties by means of judicial decision in a court of recognized authority, instead of compulsory arbitration by war. That is an object worthy the earnest efforts of the highest statesmanship; but is it not equally incumbent upon our statesmen to make an effort to abolish civil war between great corporations and their employees by establishing courts to arbitrate their differences?

Common sense demands the application to industrial disputes of the same principles that are applied to other disputes. If A and B get to fighting in the street they are brought before a court of justice and informed that they have subjected themselves to the penalties of the law; that as long as they remain in civilized society they will not be allowed to settle their difficulties by battle; that courts are established on purpose to do justice between them; and that if they cannot agree they may appeal to the courts, but must not resort to combat. Why should a corporation and its employees be permitted to fight out their quarrels in the streets to the disturbance of the peace, the interference with business, the destruction of life and property, and the annihilation of justice? Every reason that applies in the former case for putting decision by court in the place of decision by force, applies in the latter with redoubled force.

If A and B cannot be left to fight out their quarrels, nor Massachusetts and Rhode Island, Pennsylvania and New York, Turkey and Armenia, Great Britain and the United States, — if individuals and States and nations must submit to compulsory arbitration for the sake of peace and justice and liberty, why should a corporation and its employees be permitted to settle their quarrels by war in the heart of a giant city?

The substitution of peaceful, impartial, and intelligent justice for the turmoil, injustice, and destructiveness of private conflict is one of the distinguishing marks of a high civilization. It is time we extended the idea of the impartial administration of justice to the sphere of industrial difficulties. Compulsory arbitration of labor disputes means simply the extension of the control of law and order over a field which, up to the present time, has been left to chaos.

8. *Experience* in France, Belgium, and New Zealand shows that compulsory arbitration of labor difficulties is a marked success in practice, a success that need not be afraid of comparison with the results of administering justice by tribunal in other relations of life usually subjected to judicial regulation in civilized communities.

In France and Belgium compulsory arbitration has been for years an assured and successful fact; and in 1894 a strong compulsory arbitration law was adopted in New Zealand, the most progressive, in many respects, of all the British colonies.[1] In England the laws of 1824 and 1837 provided for compulsory arbitration in certain cases, but the laws were not comprehensive enough to be really useful.[2]

The most famous examples of tribunals established by law for the compulsory arbitration of labor troubles are the French "*Conseils des Prud'hommes.*" The parties may submit their differences to arbitration voluntarily. If they do not, then, after an attempt to reach an agreement has failed, the tribunal compels arbitration, and the award is enforced the same as the judgment of any other court of law.

Each council consist of eight members or more, elected for three years — half elected by the workmen in its jurisdiction, and half by the employers. Every question is within the compulsory jurisdiction except future rates of wages, which are only within the voluntary jurisdiction. As we shall see later, there is no valid reason why the compulsory jurisdiction may not be extended to the wage-rate; but even without it, there is a vast work left for compulsory arbitration to do. In France 88 per cent of the cases failing of conciliation are

[1] See "Labor Differences and their Settlement," by J. D. Weeks, p. 46 *et seq.*; Reports of French Bureau of Labor; New Zealand Year Books; North, p. 22.

[2] See Proceedings of the Congress on Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration, Civic Federation, Chicago, Nov. 13 and 14, 1894.

dealt with on the compulsory side of the court.[1] In this country more than 57 per cent of the strikes involve questions that would be subject to the compulsory jurisdiction of a court like the French council, that is, 57 per cent of our strikes involve other questions than the wage-rate.[2]

The French Labor Report for 1893 says that the "conseils" have an average of 41,000 cases a year. In 1893, 8,982 cases were settled and withdrawn before decision; 16,231 were conciliated; and 11,948 were dealt with under the compulsory jurisdiction. The report also says that these courts are characterized by speedy adjudication and a very inexpensive procedure. The total cost, even in extreme cases, where distraining is necessary, cannot exceed $8.72. The following extract from the French report just mentioned is specially worthy of note:

> The people are certainly right in attributing to the councils of experts the relative tranquillity which industry in France has enjoyed in the present century. They have prevented many strikes by assuring to workpeople a competent adjudication, speedy and inexpensive.

9. *Authority* of the highest character favors compulsory arbitration. For example, Charles Francis Adams strongly favors the measure. General Francis A. Walker speaks of strikes as "the insurrections of labor," and in his "Political Economy" says: "It is a shame for us as a people that we have not yet made for ourselves a better way out of industrial disputes." The National Farmers' Congress and the New York Society for Political Education favor the movement, and labor organizations as a rule heartily indorse it. The London Chamber of Arbitration, a board of mediation, has recently recommended, as the result of its study and experience, that a compulsory jurisdiction be added to the conciliatory jurisdiction.

A number of objections more or less serious may be raised against compulsory arbitration.

1. In the first place, it may be urged that it is an infringement of liberty.

This, of course, is not conclusive, for every law on the statute book is an infringement of somebody's liberty. Compulsory education is an infringement of liberty. Legislative acts

[1] Report of French Bureau of Labor, 1893.
[2] Report of U. S. Commissioner of Labor, 1887.

fixing rates to be charged by railways, grain elevators, water companies, telephone companies, etc., constitute infringements of liberty, yet all these things are justified by reason and experience.[1] The same statement is true of laws prescribing the height and the materials of buildings, laws against carrying arms, prohibiting nuisances, all sorts of regulations to secure the public health and safety. The question is not whether a measure is an infringement of liberty, but whether it is a *justifiable* infringement. The liberty of the individual must yield to the public good; liberty to do wrong must be curtailed in order that there may be more liberty to do right.

Liberty to buy labor in competitive market, at a price and on conditions that would not be accepted but for the duress of necessity, is a liberty to buy manhood as a commodity, and is a liberty to which no one in America has a right since the proclamation of emancipation. Such a liberty is inimical to the elevation of labor and the best development of our citizenship; it is a liberty to buy slaves by the day under compulsion of their necessities, which is near akin to the liberty to buy slaves for life under compulsion of other external circumstances, a liberty that was shot to death in the great war.

The liberty of the employer to oppress the employee must be diminished in order that the liberty of the employee to secure justice and work under fair conditions may be increased. The latter liberty cannot be increased without diminishing the former liberty, and the latter liberty is the more worthy. It is a question of the *diffusion* of liberty. Shall the employer have more than his share, all that his power and advantage can secure? That is a principle which would justify murder and arson, and the abolition of all laws against crime or tortious conduct. Or shall the liberties of the case be equitably distributed, and subject to judicial determination, so that each party may have his fair share, and no more? That is the principle on which is based the law and equity of the civilized world, and it is a principle that justifies the compulsory arbitration of labor disputes.

[1] See the Budd case, 143 U. S. 517, sustaining a law fixing the maximum charge to be made by a grain elevator at five-eighths of a cent a bushel; Spring Valley Water Works *v.* Schattler, 110 U. S. 347, same as to law fixing price to be charged for water by a private water company; 118 U. S. 557; 125 U. S. 680. Governments can fix railway charges; 111 N. Y. 132, sustaining a law reducing fares on a street railway; 105 Ind. 250; 160 Ind. 1, legislature has a right to fix rates to be charged by telephone and telegraph companies, etc.

Strikes involve a far greater interference with freedom than the proposed substitute. Strikes infringe the liberties of employers, employees, and the public; and the infringement is guided by force and passion instead of reason, wherefore it is much more apt to be an unjust infringement than compulsory arbitration is likely to be. The infringement of liberty by compulsory arbitration is less in quantity than in the case of strikes, and infinitely superior in quality, being a curtailment merely of freedom which is bad, and to which no one has a right, — freedom to be unjust, freedom to conquer a weak adversary, freedom to endanger the public peace and safety.

The objection to compulsory arbitration on the ground that it infringes liberty is largely due to the *name*. If we called the ordinary administration of justice, "compulsory arbitration of contracts, damages, and obligations in general," it would sound just as antagonistic to liberty. If we belonged to a colony about to establish courts of justice in place of the private settlement of disputes between man and man, we should be met by the same objection, that it would curtail our liberty, — the liberty of the strong to oppress the weak. If we call this measure for the compulsory arbitration of labor difficulties by its true name, — the administration of justice in labor disputes, — we remove at once the chief foundation of this objection.

How completely the objections to compulsory arbitration arise from an indiscriminate dislike of any new measure, that bears its compelling character in its title, may be seen in the fact that no one questions the advantages of *arbitration;* it is only about *compulsion* that we differ. If the parties to a dispute will voluntarily submit their difference to arbitration, and live up to the award, everyone agrees that this is the best possible method of dealing with the difficulty. But when the parties refuse to do this, as is usually the case, and insist on settling their disagreements by means of strikes, boycotts, and other sorts of industrial combat, which frequently involve enormous cost, obstruction of business, suspension of industry, disturbance of the peace, destruction of life and property, serious injustice to workingmen, widespread discontent, sullen return to labor under conditions and contracts forced upon them by want, and the antagonisms and debasements of character that come from conflict, — then the question arises whether it is not best to *require* the parties to submit their

differences to an impartial tribunal, instead of fighting them out on the street; whether, when conciliation fails, it is not better that the difficulty should be settled according to principles of equity, by compulsion acting through a court of justice upon both parties equally, rather than according to principles of greed and passion, and by compulsion of one party by the other. Where conciliation fails, compulsion of one kind or the other must decide the contest. We have to choose between compulsion of the weaker party by the stronger, and a compulsion of the party found to be in the wrong, after a careful hearing and impartial deliberation by a disinterested tribunal. We believe the latter best, for reasons already given.

2. But we are told that it is *impracticable* to fix wages for the future, and that it would be *unjust*, because the award can be enforced only against the employer; the employees may leave if the wages do not suit them.

Well, even if we leave the wage-rate out of court, there is still a great deal for compulsory arbitration to do, as we have already seen. But in truth there is no need to leave it out. So far is it from impracticable, that the fact is, wages are continually fixed for the future. The bulk of our business is based on such settlements. If a sliding scale is adopted, wages may safely be fixed for considerable periods in advance, and are so fixed to-day. (The only question is, whether this shall be done by force or by the judgment of a court.) Which is the more likely to err? Which is the more likely to be lived up to? The employees are not bound to continue at the wages fixed by a strike or by voluntary arbitration. In practice, it will probably be found that they will be satisfied with the wage-rate fixed by the court of arbitration. It may not be all they asked for, but it will in most cases be likely to be an improvement on what they could get without arbitration, or, problematically, by a disastrous strike.

The possible want of mutuality is not a serious matter. There is certainly no more lack of it than in the case of fixing hours or charges. The question is at best theoretic rather than practical. There is no difficulty in getting men at the wages offered by the companies, and there will not be any difficulty in getting them at the wages fixed by a court or commission, so that the lack of power to compel men to work at the wages fixed does not practically detract from the

reciprocal character of the award, to say nothing of other considerations. Even were the reciprocal element entirely lacking, it would not exclude the measure. This element *is* lacking in many contracts sustained by the law, those, namely, which constitute a title of contract law called "unilateral contracts."

In any case, if they do not stay, it is clear the wages are too low, and the employer must raise them if he wishes to keep his men. The court merely fixes the limit below which the employer must not go. He may pay more, must pay more if his workmen find they can do better elsewhere. There is no substantial lack of mutuality. The employer is not compelled to continue doing business, and the employee is not compelled to continue working.

If the employer cannot make the business pay at the wages demanded, because of low wages in his business elsewhere, or for other cause beyond his control, he should bring his books and his evidence into court and prove the fact, and the court will be careful not to put the wage-rate where it would destroy the employer's business, recommending, if need be, such general legislation as would affect the whole trade and lift wages to a proper level without injustice to individual employers.

In dealing with monopolies, such as gas and electric plants, street railways, and other quasi-public industries, this difficulty will not in most cases be apt to arise. The adjustment of wages would not be complicated by questions of competition.

No method short of coöperation can deal with the wage question in a fully satisfactory manner. Compulsory arbitration is simply the best method attainable until coöperation comes.

3. It is said that governmental fixing of rates and wages amounts to *confiscation;* that conciliation and mediation are better than compulsory arbitration; that a court or commission can be empowered to examine the cause and justice of each industrial dispute at its inception, fix the responsibility, and leave public opinion to compel redress; that, whatever may be thought of the general philosophy of individual liberty, and its limitation by law, the right of free contract is a settled principle in our jurisprudence, and an employer has a right to fix the terms on which he will employ labor, without

dictation from anyone; that compulsory arbitration will entail recognition of tradesunions and the right to continued employment; and that it will delay more vital reforms by alleviating to some extent the discontent of labor. To these and other objections the curious may find an answer in the *American Fabian* for March, 1897.

On the whole, it appears to the writer that a strong industrial jurisdiction will be of great advantage in preventing strikes and, in many cases, lockouts also, in bringing employers and employed together in mutual conference and equality instead of in the relation of servitude, in promoting mutual confidence and respect, and in preparing the way for a nobler industrial system than any the world has yet seen.

DEMOCRACY — ITS ORIGINS AND PROSPECTS.

By JOHN CLARK RIDPATH, LL.D.

THE Good Sans-culotte of Nazareth was a democrat. He did not belong to a democratic party, but to the Democracy of Man. He taught the equality of all men, the inequality and subjection of none. His principles were accordant with the great fact of human brotherhood. He was always with the people and for them. His favor was for the common lot; his disfavor was for the oligarchy and the temple. His life, in so far as we are able to trace its outlines in the existing fragments, was a part of his teaching. It was devoted in the first place to the poor folk of Judæa, and in its ultimate destiny to the humble democracy of the Gentile races.

We do not here enlarge upon the doctrines and influence of the Good Sans-culotte. We simply emphasize the essential principle of his teaching and example. That essential principle was *the notion of human fraternity*. The merit of his work lay almost wholly in this direction. Whence he derived the doctrine, we are not curious to inquire. Certainly among the followers of Guatama, in the far valley of the Indus, such notion had long before prevailed. Perhaps the young man of Galilee had travelled thither between his twelfth and thirtieth years, and had sojourned, as tradition has it, in the monasteries of Buddha. Perhaps, on the other hand, the doctrine of equality is higher than any priesthood, whether Aryan or Semitic; higher than merely human hopes; higher than the earth-born dreams of men.

In any event the founder of the new faith, on his reappearance in Palestine, brought the doctrine of equality with him — brought it (it matters not) either from the East or out of his own soul. And in disseminating this doctrine he became an insurgent, a revolutionist, an iconoclast. The hand of the Galilean was lifted high against the religious institutions of his own race and epoch, and by implication it was lifted high against all like institutions in the world. True, he tolerated the political order established by Rome in his native country,

but he passed it by as something in which he found no interest or delight. He told his hearers to pay their taxes and say nothing. As to secular government and its methods, he said neither yea or nay. The institutions of society he virtually ignored. The keynote of all that he said and taught in his random ministry was the brotherhood and equality of men.

This doctrine the Teacher taught in many places. He sowed the seeds of equality in the principal cities of Judæa; afterwards the germs were scattered along the highways of Asia Minor and Europe. This idea of a democracy of man was borne far in course of time, and became seminal, with varying vicissitudes of growth, among all the peoples west of the Dardanelles and north of the Mediterranean.

The Great Greek of ancient Hellas was also a democrat. He antedated by several centuries the Asian reformer out of Palestine. The sons of Hellen, as we first discover them in the Ægean Islands and on the coast of Ionia, were equalizers and levellers; they levelled upward. It is difficult to know to what extent their Aryan progenitors were like them in this respect. Whether the emigrant Hellenes *found* equality on their arrival in Thrace and the Cyclades and on the shores of Southeastern Europe is matter of conjecture; but they at least *possessed* democracy and developed it to a higher degree than has ever been done by any other civilized race of men.

We shall not here consider how much of the democracy of the Greeks was due to their environment, how much to ethnic descent, and how much to the peculiar evolution which came with their removal and settlement in the new Europe of antiquity. We observe, however, that the narrow limits of the Attic peninsula and the broken and picturesque character of the country could hardly account for the total differentiation of a people out of the slavish Asiatic condition into a state of individual freedom and equality; for the physical conditions prevalent in Attica existed also in Lacedæmonia, where the Spartan aristocracy rose and flourished, and where the principles of true Grecian equality were never recognized, or only recognized to be condemned and hated. The Dorians were the supreme oligarchs of antiquity.

Doubtless there was something inherent in the Ionian and Attic Greeks that led them on to democratic opinions and to the creation of those popular institutions for which their small but glorious states have been immemorially famous. Under

these free institutions, the Greek democracy flourished. Here rose and reigned the most intellectual race of men that ever inhabited the world, the most artistic and literary race that has appeared in the tides of time. Here came the men of genius. Here sprang and flourished, as if in immortal youth and vigor, a people whose language and arts and learning, under Macedonian banners, were destined to be borne north, south, east, and west, touching, we might say, all the existing institutions of mankind, and touching nothing which they did not enliven and glorify. The Greek ascendency appeared for several centuries to be the dawn of the Age of Gold.

The Teutonic barbarian of northern Europe was the third great democrat of the ancient world, the third progenitor of the notion of equality among the modern peoples. He was divided from the Asian democrat of Nazareth by race, by time, by seas, by continents of space. He was divided from the Great Greek by mountains and forests, and by the deep gorges of race divergence and development. But like the other two, he was a missionary of equality — a rude and barbaric scatterer of the seeds of brotherhood in the most forbidding places of the world.

Long before the epoch when the Roman race first touched the Germanic nations beyond the Rhine, the latter had produced in the solitudes of their forests another Democracy of Man, as true in its kind as the democracy of the great Greeks or as that of the first Christians at Jerusalem and Antioch. There was something in the Teutonic race, even from the far prehistoric days when that race debouched into Europe, that tended ever and irresistibly to the equality and brotherhood of mankind.

This indeed was a rough and turbulent democracy. It was a democracy of rational barbarism, of cruel humanity, of untutored wisdom, of savage progress. Turning the pages of Tacitus and other writers contemporary with the ancient Germans, we must be surprised to note the unexpected fact among them of the equality of man with man. The principle was deep-rooted and universal. It was a democracy as tender as life and as harsh as death.

The theory of tribal organization among the Old Germans was democratic in the extreme; and the practice was like it. The German chieftain was never more than a leader of

equals; the German king was never more than an equal of his chieftains; the German warriors were never more than equals of the German women. Look at the fragments of art that have transmitted the social condition of these races. See De Neuville's great picture of the German women in battle. There in the midst of the terrible mêlée, equal in carnage and heroism to the battles of Homer, the rude wagons of the nation are parked, and in them stand the Junos of the northern woods, with eyes aflame and streaming yellow hair, and battle-axe and spear uplifted to smite with death-blows the puny men of the South. Such was the sublime brotherhood among the powerful barbarians of the Germanic race that one in the retrospect might well sigh for the reappearance of such a people on the notched and half-defended horizons of modern civilization. And, to anticipate a possible sequel, they will be there — *when the United States shall become a Roman Empire.*

These three sources of human equality — Syrian, Hellenic, Teutonic — sent forth the primary streams of democracy among the nations of the ancient world. The Asian source was mostly *religious* in character; the Hellenic fountain was *political*, and the Teutonic spring was *social*. In course of time and in the vicissitudes of races and nations, the three sources flowed into the same receptacle, to be distributed as transmuted forms of force by the agency of a single stupendous power to the peoples of after times.

The equality taught and practised by the Good Sans-culotte was, as we have intimated, in its final analysis, ethical and religious. It contemplated the moral nature of man, not his organizing propensities. It looked to the diffusion in the human race of certain ideas and principles by which the race should be regenerated in character and purpose. There was to be a new birth in the soul of mankind; and the new life should grow instead of the old, and prevail over it, until the old, at last decrepit and useless, should fall off like a cast garment and be no more. Vain is the attempt, vain has always been the hope, of the religious sophist to discover in the teaching of the Son of Mary a reason and justification for the vast and inane ecclesiastical institutions which dominated the Middle Ages, and which remain as an inheritance to modern times, as if they had been washed hither by the diluvial floods of a prehistoric epoch.

The Great Greek, on the other hand, busied himself with the creation of a political and intellectual democracy. This may be regarded as the primary fact and principle of the Hellenic evolution. At bottom the Greek had little of the religious concept. He had less of the practice of religion. He was as poor in worship as the Galilean was poor in politics. The outward development of the faith of the Greek was spectacular and artistic rather than institutional, and the subjective concept in his worship of the gods related to the advantage which he hoped to get in the bargain with them. He built temples because they were beautiful, and immolated victims because to do so was a tragedy. To the Greek mind the foundation of a religious *ecclesia* would have seemed superfluous and absurd.

The Teutonic principle of equality had respect almost wholly to the social life of the people. The development of the race tended ever to the creation of a social democracy. We may anticipate much by saying that this bottom trait of Teutonism has remained to the present day. Socialism was not so much a portent to Ariovistus and Wittekind as it is to the reigning Kaiser. True, the ancient German had his gods and his altars. He had also to a limited degree his politics and his *res publica*, or public affair. He went so far as to establish tribal institutions and intertribal relations and practices. But the central fact of the great Germanic ascendency was — as it has ever continued to be — the social life of the race. Social equality may well be said to have been born and first proclaimed along the dark rivers and in the moaning woods of northern Europe.

To trace the course and evolution of modern democracy from its three fountains in Palestine, Hellas, and Germania, or more properly its three fountains in the heart of the Good Sans-culotte, the heart of the Great Greek, and the heart of the Great Teuton, would include the most interesting and important sections of human history. Whoever should understand thus much would possess a knowledge of the substance of what civilization has accomplished in the mediæval and modern world. I believe that the story of democracy in its issuance from its threefold source down to its present aspect and condition among the nations, if truly and pathetically told, would surpass the *Iliad* and all the other epics of race-life and human tragedy. To delineate the historical

destinies and adaptations of democracy is a task beyond the present powers of man — a task to be remanded in the future ages to some tall son of the morning. Only an imperfect outline of so great a theme can here be given.

The doctrine of the Good Sans-culotte, beginning in Judæa, crept like a vine around the shores of the Mediterranean. It found the great central peninsula on the north, and there gained support and propagation by twining itself about the porticos and sending its roots into the imperial hearths of Rome. It was planted on the Capitoline hill and in the Circus Maximus. It spread over the eternal walls, and climbed as high as the cypresses that now wave in the starlight over the rent battlements of the Colosseum.

Christianity in southern Europe was thus merged with the greatest state of antiquity. "Thou hast conquered, O Galilean!" was proclaimed in the city of the Cæsars. The religious fact and the political fact were united henceforth in structural development. The doctrine which at first issued as a moral influence from the eastern shore of the Mediterranean became organic as a part of the Roman Empire. Ever afterwards the religious element was in close affiliation with political power; and the time came when the one was even as the other. The appeal to man was replaced with an appeal to secular compulsion. Simple principles were supplanted by organic contrivances. Authority usurped the place of spiritual force, and glory took the throne. The Imperial *State* already existed, and there soon arose under its ægis an Imperial *Ecclesia*. The wide humanities and tender rebukes of the Man of Galilee and the comparatively simple teachings of his immediate followers were engulfed in the marble heart and austere ceremonies of Rome.

The Roman sway extended from Parthia to Ireland, and from Jutland and the North Sea to the African deserts. The standard of Cæsar and the standard of the Christ went together into all the included regions. The eagle and the cross were set up beyond the pillars of Hercules, on the banks of the Thames, in the lowlands of the Northwest, in the dark woods by the Weser and the Danube, along the coasts of Africa, in Egypt, in Arabia, among the ruins of the cities of Asia Minor, and as far as the waste places of Mesopotamia. The dreaded short sword of Rome and the Bishop's high mitre were seen together in almost every

walled town of Europe, and often together on the field of battle. Organic Christianity was in a word blended with Rome, and henceforth shared the vicissitudes, the triumphs, and the final disruption of that imperial power.

This power was well fitted to propagate itself throughout the civilized world; but it was ill fitted to be the receptacle of moral institutions and religious faith. Least of all was it fitted to be the promoter of human brotherhood. Human brotherhood! What did Rome know of that? Equality of rights was something diametrically opposed to her and all her policies. The democracy of man was unknown to her. Not on *that* foundation was the imperial structure builded. The imperial structure was founded on a basis of human gradations and organic contrivances that had always slavery as their concrete. The massive walls of the Cæsarian Empire were laid with a mortar of human blood and human hopes, mixed and plastered by the remorseless masons with as little compunction as if the ingredients had been lime and sand and water.

Rome was the cruellest and most remorseless power that was ever reared on the shores of earth. It was an oligarchy to begin with. Tarquin was a true type of its first development; Catiline, of its second; and Nero, of its third. War, conquest, subjugation of provinces, and robbery of peoples were the common and necessary processes of the imperial growth. Ambition, greed, arrogance, licentious pride, and brutal gratification were the subjective elements of Roman hauteur and glory. Strange that such a faith as that of the Good Sans-culotte should have entered into union with such a power, only to be lost in the building of a religious structure as bloody and prodigious as its confederate! But such was the decree of history.

It was also decreed that the democracy of the Greek should be merged in Rome. The soul of Socrates was to grovel at the feet of Tiberius. As long as the men of Hellas were able to preserve their democratic institutions, they flourished as no other people have flourished in the world. Their civilization was glorious. There was a period of incomparable renown. Out of that epoch of freedom and fame the better part of the intellectual splendor of the modern world has been derived. The *intellectual* life of the Greeks could not be dissipated even by the annihilation of the race. Only

their *political* life — their organic democracy — was subject to destruction.

The fate of that democracy was in many respects analogous to the fate of primary Christianity; the former as well as the latter became the prey of the spoiler. In the second century before our era, the Roman power, still calling itself a republic, first robbed, then ruined, and finally obliterated the Grecian race. Behold in the Isthmian amphitheatre at Corinth, the Consul Flaminius (the picture is by Vogel) proclaiming the *liberty* of the Greeks under the wing of Rome — such liberty as the sparrow finds under the wing of the eagle. All of the renown and splendor of the Hellenic race that might be seized with the hand was borne away as the booty of the conquerors. It was distributed in the capital, and then in the smaller cities, towns, and villas of Italy.

In so far as the doctrine of equality inhered in the intellectual treasure of the Greek people, that notion was not extinguished by conquest. It could not be; for it was imperishable. There was a sense in which Hellenic democracy could never be wholly quenched. It resided as an inspiring force in the literary treasures and artistic monuments of the race. These were borne away and transmitted by an ignorant and uncreative people to become the inheritance of the modern world. Rome thus took within herself not only the new faith proclaimed by the Galilean, making it useful to her ambitions and a part of her imposing structure; but she also devoured the brilliant and beautiful civilization of the Greeks. Like the monster that she was, she consumed without knowing its value and immortal beauty the choicest and most precious pearl of creation. The elephant of the Tiber, like the beast of Hindu fable, swallowed the morning star, and knew no difference.

The democracy of the Teutonic race also came into contact with Rome, but was *not* consumed. Strange it is to see the three primary streams of democracy tending each towards the common goal, two of them disappearing in the gulf, and the third rushing in as a flood. True, institutional Christianity was not obliterated by its union with the Roman Empire. On the contrary, it became powerful by the union, and was able at length, even on the ruins of the great frame to which it had attached itself, to be propagated into the better part of the known lands and islands of the world. But its essential element, the notion of a compassionate and uni-

versal human brotherhood, was absorbed in the thick and sluggish currents of Roman blood; the cry of humanity was quenched in the shout of triumph. True also, the spirit of Greek democracy survived, while its body perished. But the democracy of the Germanic nations was not so quenched. The iron head of Teutonism, driven by the freedom of the North, was swung against the fortresses of the Rhine, and they were broken. Hermann plucked down the Cæsarian eagles. There was a rush of shouting warriors through the passes of the Alps. The southern peninsulas of Europe were drowned in the deluge. It was a wholesome flood, hiding from the sun the most colossal and injurious despotism that history has ever known.

The German race was thus *laid over* the races of the South and West. Gaul received her Franks, Italy received her Ostrogoths, Spain and Africa their Visigoths, and Britain her Jutes and Saxons. The great Germanic era ensued, extending from the sixth century to the revival of learning. There was a mélange of nations and peoples. The Teutonic democrat planted himself amid the ruins of darkened Europe. In this situation he began to lose what Rome had been unable to take from him. He became feudal. He created the feudal institutions. His blood commingled with the blood of Celt and Roman and Iberian. He gave to each a measure of his energy and free spirit; but he received from each a portion of the slavish sentiments and methods which had prevailed in Romanized Europe. From the subjected races he caught the infection of political and military power. He became a leader in the Crusades, and then a petty king, growing into a greater king. By the absorption of the weaker, the feudal estates of the continent were enlarged into monarchies. One had its capital on the Danube; another, on the Seine; another, on the Thames; another, on the Manzanares, until modern Europe emerged, having war for its mood, oppression for its method, and the enslavement of the people for its end and aim.

Thus out of the bankruptcy of the Roman Empire the political and religious estates of modern Europe have been created. And for many centuries it has been a question with the heirs who shall have the greater part of the imperial wealth and power. After the Roman wreck the mediæval monarchies arose, and these became the modern monarchies. They all claimed to be Christian. Some of them taught, but

none of them practised, or could practise, the doctrines of human brotherhood. All were involved in an historical paradox that could be solved only by casuistry and hypocrisy. There came to pass throughout all Europe a fortification, a building of ramparts, around organic power and tyranny. Meanwhile the humble race of men to whom the Good Sansculotte had addressed his teaching relapsed into barbarism, superstition, and slavery.

To this indescribable inheritance our modern age has succeeded. Upon it modern civilization has been planted. Out of this chaotic substratum the recent era has drawn the greater part of its nutriment. All of the baneful saps and foul air of the Middle Ages have been absorbed by the modern powers of society ; and there is no telling to what extent all men between the Bosporus and the Sacramento, between Iceland and Mecca, have been poisoned and depraved.

The new era in Europe and America professes to be Christian. It professes to be intellectual, refined, artistic, poetic, like the Greeks. It professes to possess and to cherish the freedom and independent spirit of the Teutonic races. It professes to espouse the principles of human equality and to promote the democracy of man. But the modern era knows in its heart that its profession is a delusion and a lie. The modern era knows that it has its face, its affection, and its purpose set with a smile towards imperial splendor, towards the organic powers that are over man, and that only its hinder parts are turned with contempt on the man himself. The man has become an object of indifference or aversion to every state, and in a measure to every ecclesiastical establishment in the world. He who looks abroad among the nations to find an organic structure under which a residue of genuine democracy is cherished — such democracy as would be agreeable to the founder of the Christian religion or to Socrates — will search long or search in vain. He will indeed find a residue of genuine democracy, but will find it on the remote outskirts of society, in far places by woods and streams, on the prairies wide, in the filthy purlieus and cellars of towns and cities.

Nearly all the enlightened peoples of the world, however, are more or less permeated with democracy. Few there are among the intelligent classes of any nation who are not touched with some sentiment or notion of human brotherhood

and man-rule on the earth. Some are thus affected on the moral or religious side of their natures; with others the notion of democracy is an intellectual and political concept, deduced, as we have said, from the free Greeks of antiquity ; and with others still it is a race instinct derived from the Teutonic nations.

Democracy pure and simple, existing among the poor and humble of mankind, is thus reinforced by a limited and widely diffused democratic sentiment among the middle and upper classes of society. Every radical community lies adjacent to some other community less radical; that, to another still more moderate but in some sense democratic; and that, in touch with still another little influenced by the sentiment of human equality or positively devoted to centralization and empire.

This widely diffused principle of democracy among the nations, beginning with a pure form among the humble and ending with a mixed and feeble form among the great, has produced the revolutionary and regenerating movements among the modern nations. Political society in almost every European and American country has sought at times to purify itself by a revolt in the direction of democracy. Every revolution has shown us the conflict of an insurgent democratic party with an imperial and despotic party. This is the final analysis and explanation of all insurrections. Every great upheaval of secular society which the world has witnessed since the revival of learning has been in its ultimate character a battle of Democracy with Empire.

The first conspicuous revolt of this kind was that of the Dutch Netherlands, in the last half of the sixteenth century. The next great insurrection was that of the Puritan democracy of Great Britain, in the Cromwellian era, against the Stuarts and their affiliated powers on the continent. The third and best of all was our American rebellion of 1776, with its attendant battle for freedom and its result of Independence. Hard after this came the most radical and thorough of all the historical insurrections — the Revolution in France. A purer democracy has never appeared than that which confronted Bourbon rule and French aristocracy in the closing decade of the eighteenth century. Since that epoch the democrats of France have passed through successive eras of overthrow and emergence; but the principle of the great revolt has sur-

vived, and the fiery Republic of 1792 has reappeared in the modified Republic of 1870. The Civil War in the United States, though it had its origins mostly in domestic and social conditions, was also a struggle for a truer democracy. Both sides claimed to be for a democratic ascendency. The solution of the social problem, however, was effected in such manner by sword and legislation as to put American democracy on a worse footing than before.

It is highly instructive to note in the revolutionary movements of the past three hundred years the varying proportions among the elements of the attacking democracy. Thus, for example, the insurrection of the Netherlands was a religio-social movement; that is, it was a Teutonic revolt inspired with moral principles. The Dutch fought for religious emancipation; but they fought in the spirit of the Teutonic race. Their revolution had in it also an intellectual element derived ultimately from Greek democracy. The Dutch leaders were not unfamiliar with those political and intellectual conditions which made the Hellenic ascendency the most brilliant of antiquity. Egmont and Horn and Orange were well versed in the history and politics of the Greeks. The Cromwellian rebellion was an insurrection of which the elementary forces were Teutonic and religious; but it was lacking in intellectual force and grandeur. There was never, perhaps, another so great work done by men in civilized times with so little of intellect and culture in the movement. Cromwell, a priest in armor, virtually monopolized the brains of the revolution and the commonwealth. After him, around him, there was nothing but a certain moral enthusiasm and the equalizing instincts of a Teutonic people.

Our own rebellion against the Mother Country was greater than either of its predecessors. It was wiser than the revolt of French democracy which came hard after. It were difficult to say whether the intellectual, the moral, or the race element prevailed most powerfully in the work of our fathers of the Revolutionary era. They were an intellectual race of men. They were giants. They had the enthusiasm of the Greeks. They were also strongly imbued with moral instincts. They were deeply affected with the influences of their ethnic descent. They came from an English, that is a Teutonic, ancestry.

For these reasons our revolt against the insane tyranny of

a dullard king was more rational and complete than that of the Netherlands against Spanish cruelties, or that of the English commonwealth against the tyranny of the reigning House. Our Declaration of Independence was the most rational and well-grounded political expression ever produced by the genius and patriotism of mankind. It was the most reasonably democratic. It was the most just and justifiable of all charters of its kind. It was moral; it was an intellectual product. It was pervaded with a deep sense of right and wrong, of a profound morality. It spoke as if appealing to the favor of heaven, and with ideas near akin to those disseminated by the founder of the Christian faith. It was done in the high spirit of the Greeks. It was as truly democratic in principle as anything ever proclaimed from the pnyx or the stoa. It was a declaration from the heart of the Teutonic race. It was a world-wide cry for freedom, for the reinstitution of mankind, for the elevation of the individual, and for the abatement of those malign powers that sat upon his vitals.

Fair was the prospect of American democracy at the Revolutionary era. It is doubtful whether there was ever another epoch in history which contained so much of promise. Much of that promise has been justified in the sequel. It cannot be denied that the American Republic has had a great career. On the other hand, it must be admitted that democracy has suffered in the course of our national history. The sentiments which inspired our fathers, the influences by which they were guided, the principles which they proclaimed and fought for, have been confused and retarded not a little in the evolution of our career; and at no time have the confusion and retardation been more alarming than in the present era. A great part of the patriotic zeal which fired the hearts of our colonial ancestors has been quenched and lost. Another part of that sublime spirit is still preserved in the hearts and purposes of the American people.

On the whole there has been a manifest decline in the force and prevalence of the bold, free democracy of our fathers. They who speak of the current prevalence of Jeffersonian principles speak nothing but ignorance and delusion. Gradually the imperial spirit has entered our national consciousness. Gradually it has supplanted the radical sentiments and principles of the founders of the Republic. Gradually it has transformed, and is still transforming, our institutions. At

no particular date has this transformation been alarming; but the aggregate result has become dangerous in the extreme to the preservation of our old-time liberties and to the further spread of these liberties and the rights of men. It is not too much to say that the Democratic Republic which was instituted by our fathers — by declaration, by battle, by sacrifice and patriotic consecration — is rapidly becoming, or has already become, an Imperial Republic, not without its striking analogy to that Imperial Republic of Rome which preceded the Empire.

In the name of reason and history, why is it that this tremendous miscarriage seems to threaten the American Republic? Why is it that here, as elsewhere in all the civilized countries, the ruin and suppression of democracy seem to impend? Why is it that like melancholy miscarriages have disfigured the history of the past, rendering its final results dubious and sorrowful? In the retrospect of human experience is it possible to find out where and when the teaching of humanity has become the teaching of inhumanity; where and when the principle of human freedom has become the principle of servitude; where and when the common hopes and purposes of men have given place to antagonism and bloody strifes; where and when individuality and man-rule have been obliterated in order that power may grow; where and when the equality of men has become inequality, degenerating ever towards a profound and loathsome slavery?

These tremendous questions may be answered thus: Democracy has in all countries been crippled by *the overorganization of society*. Not by legitimate and rational organization has this great hurt been done to the progress of mankind. It is the abuse of the organizing instinct that has brought about so many fatal lapses among the freedom-seeking peoples of the world.

Human society begins in equality; it is organized into inequality. The particular point at which the dangerous abuse begins is the point at which organization becomes an *end* instead of a *means*. No organization ever created by men has the right of self-existence. Every such contrivance invented by our race has been invented as a means unto an end; and that end rationalized is the elevation and perfection of the individual life. Whenever the organization begins to exist for itself, the individual life begins to languish, human hope begins to

expire, the spirit of man becomes clouded, the genius of the highest is most obscured. And with the appearance of this malady in the inner life of the race all of its outward liberties and rights and prospects of freedom begin to droop and perish.

A great part of human history is involved with this baneful use of organization. Society, we are confident, must organize in order to exist. Society is good, not bad. Political society is subject to the common law. So also is religious society. Organization is not essentially a vice; but it is the common experience of mankind that organization becomes more and more excessive with the progress of a given people until they find themselves overdone and mastered by their own vehicle. At a certain stage a sudden reversal comes to pass. The car of civilization gets before the engine, and the further progress of the given people is turned into retrogression declining into night.

Let us look boldly at these facts and principles. The institutions of society are to be judged thereby. Their usefulness and their right to exist depend upon their conformity to the common law. Races and nations have been organized to death. In such case, the temple, instead of being built for the man, has been built upon him. No poet, no artist, no statesman, no benefactor of his race, no hopeful son of mankind with the light of the dawn in his brain and the twitter of the song-birds in his spirit, can survive under the walls of a temple. No more can he survive under the walls of a palace. No more can he survive under the walls of an arsenal, or the walls of fortresses. The poet, the orator, the master-spirit of the age, require freedom as their condition and liberty as their sphere.

Nations are made for men; men are not made for nations. Governments either exist for the people or do not exist at all, — that is, they do not exist under the ethical and logical conditions of civilization. Every government which becomes an entity, self-existing, self-perpetuating, self-conscious, and self-determinative, is a monstrous abuse, a blot under the sun. Every ecclesiastical organization which is not created and kept in the service of man is an inane and baleful portent that deserves extinction wherever the rivers run and the starlight falls.

Every other institution of society is under the same law of

human service. Every other, as much as the political and ecclesiastical structures, must yield to the service of man or be finally expelled from the earth. Civilization itself, while it is a man-product, is also a servant of the race. Let none think to glorify civilization at the expense of humanity. Let none think that the perpetuity of institutions and the preservation of race-life at its highest estate depend upon building high the physical apparatus and symbols of civilization. These indeed are good; they are good while they *serve;* they are dreadful when they *master.*

The struggle of Democracy with Empire still continues in the world; and we hope that it will continue until the victory is won, as it certainly will be in the final day, by the armies of right and truth. The imperial elements of society in the Old World and the New are seriously alarmed at the growth and persistency of democratic principles among the nations. Let their alarm continue; it is wholesome. It must needs be that the advocates of despotism should suffer fear. Every evil thing in this world is afraid. Every good thing in the world has courage.

In course of time the civilization of mankind will be democratic and not imperial. From the rivers to the seas, democracy — not indeed the democracy of a party, but the democracy of man — is going to prevail. Men are destined to be free. The elements of tyranny and enslavement shall be extinguished. The future shall bring a condition of human society throughout the world in which freedom shall be yoked with order, and the equality of all men be recognized as the fundamental fact in the life of nations.

The doctrines advanced in this article have a special as well as a general significance. The exposition of the subject has been made with some reference to the vehicle by which it is to be carried to the public. It is intended that what is here presented shall signify a part of the purpose of the literary organ by which it is communicated to others. THE ARENA MAGAZINE stands for democracy — for such democracy as was believed in by our fathers and was by them made organic in a free Republic. In this phraseology there is no reference to the democracy of a particular party or division of our American society or any other society of our time.

This magazine is intended to be an agency for the preservation of the pure spirit and essence of our institutions. The equality of men is perhaps the fundamental fact in these institutions; and to be a humble advocate in the defence and maintenance of that equality is not unworthily cherished by this organ of public opinion. It is devoted to the progress and betterment of our people, and is an open court to every capable advocate of truth and righteousness.

AN OLIVE BRANCH OF THE CIVIL WAR.

By LA SALLE CORBELL PICKETT.[1]

WE were all ranged around the fire, comfortably gazing at the little blue tongues of flame that would now and then leap up as if attacking some invisible enemy, and then retire to wait for another foe or lazily die out, when I noticed on Colonel Manning's hand, which was grasping his knee, a gold ring of such enormous size as to excite from me the question as to how in the world he ever came into the possession of such a monster. The ring was square-edged, more than half an inch wide and proportionately thick, and was surmounted by a gold buckle that seemed to magnify it to twice its huge dimensions.

"Well, well," said the old Colonel, turning to me, "it is strange that during the past three years of close friendship you have never noticed that ring before, when I have had to explain to so many strangers what would seem a very petty and vulgar ostentation to one unacquainted with its history and the varying and interesting memories which it recalls. However, it is a long, long story, — too long, perhaps, to tell to-night, so I will postpone its recital to another time."

"Let us hear it, let us hear it," we all cried in unison, and the Colonel, with a soft smile of satisfaction lighting up his face, began in his own interesting way his story, which runs as follows:

During May, 1864, the army of the Potomac, under General Grant, was one of the combatants in that series of engagements known in history as the Battle of the Wilderness. General Meade was in immediate command, while the regiment in which I held a commission as captain, formed a part of General Getty's division of Sedgwick's corps.

The Wilderness was a wild track, covered with dense woods of black-jack trees, and some few large oaks, and stretching along the south bank of the Rapidan river for about ten miles.

It was General Grant's purpose and endeavor to push his

[1] Better known popularly as Mrs. General Pickett, widow of late General Pickett, of Gettysburg fame.

army southward, so as to get between General Lee and Richmond; but that brilliant soldier, having accurate maps of the country, and divining Grant's intention, began, on May 5th, an attack on the Federal flank. The Federal troops then held Brock road, a road which bisected the Wilderness from east to west, and it was by moving up a plank road and the turnpike from Orange Court House (two roads running at right angles to the Federal lines) that the Confederates struck the Union forces.

General Getty, our division commander, had received orders to hold the junction of the plank and Brock roads until he could be reënforced by Hancock, who was then about ten miles away. The fighting was something terrific; the bullets seemed to come in bucketfuls, and to hum and hiss, and sing and thud, as they sped on their missions of death. About the middle of the day we were so hard pressed by the enemy's skirmishers, who swarmed in the woods opposite and were sticking it to us from every tree and bush, that we were compelled to fall back about seventy-five yards from the dirt road. While on this short retreat I received a severe wound that stretched me helpless on the ground. A bullet had struck me near the centre of the chest, passing through one of my lungs, and abrading my spinal column on its way out. There I was at the foot of a large oak, believing myself mortally wounded, bleeding from the mouth, and my arms paralyzed, sadly waiting for death. Around me were the enemy's skirmishers, some of whom had crossed the road; and right above me, behind the very tree at whose foot I lay, was a big six-foot rebel, pegging away for dear life. He seemed very earnest about what he was doing, and as he would lower his gun after firing, I could hear him mutter "By God! I got a major that time," or a colonel or a captain, as the case might be, and then he would raise his gun with the remark, "Now, old gal, see what you can do for 'um."

I almost forgot my wound listening to the conversation he was holding with his gun, and watching his actions. Presently, as he was leaning from the tree preparatory to taking another shot, I heard that peculiar and unmistakable sound which a bullet makes when striking the flesh, and sure enough down he came almost on top of me. He lay perfectly still for about a minute, and then he turned over on his left side, and I heard him speak:

"Say, Yank, are you much hurt?"

"Yes," I answered feebly, "I am awfully wounded; I know I shall die."

"Oh!" he said, "don't talk that way, Yank; you 'll get well all right; cheer up and talk to me."

Then there was a few minutes when neither of us spoke, during which I was thinking of my home, and my wife waiting and hoping for my return, wondering why I was gone so long and if the war would never end. I was sick at heart, and suffering and melancholy, believing that I had but a little while to live. I thought how sad it was to die under any circumstances, but how much sadder away from those I loved, those who would never, perhaps, hear of me again, but who would never grow weary of waiting through the long days and nights praying for my return. Then I remembered my little ones, saw them clinging to their mother, leaning their young heads against her, and asking when Papa would be back. What would she say to all these questions when weeks and months and years had passed away, and still no word of Papa coming home? The picture was too much for me, my whole body shook, and great scalding tears flowed down my face — the saddest in all my life. Remembering too that my wife's picture, with a bundle of her sweet letters to me, was in my breast-pocket, I addressed the Confederate soldier lying by me.

"Johnnie," I called (for I knew not his name), and my voice was weak and plaintive, — "Johnnie, can you reach me and take from my breast-pocket a bundle of letters and a picture?"

"Certingly I will, Yank," he answered; and he did what I had asked.

"Now, Johnnie, will you put that picture to my lips and then let me look at it, for I shall soon be gone."

He did again as I requested, and when he saw the tears streaming from my eyes, he began with visible emotion to console me:

"Come, come, Yank! don't cry; you 'll get well in a little while: you make a fellow feel bad when you talk that-a-way. Try and stand it. God knows I 'm sorry for you, Yank. Try and not think of sich things."

The poor big-hearted fellow was almost crying himself, but, after all, I insisted on his keeping the letters.

"Keep them," I said, "and when this war is over, for it can't last much longer, send them to my wife and tell her how I died. Tell her that my last thoughts were of her, that with my last words I begged God's blessing on her and our little babies. Oh, Johnnie, do not fail to do what a dying man begs of you."

"Well, Yank," he replied, in a voice that seemed more resigned, "if you must die, don't you think you ought to pray?"

I said I had repeated my prayers to myself many times.

"But, Yank," he continued to advise, "you had better hand in a few more; it can't do any harm, and it might do a damn sight of good."

In spite of my condition I was almost amused at his rude philosophy, but he spoke in sober earnestness, and ended his advice by saying that he used to know prayers once himself, but he had clean forgot them all. As he talked on I saw a great deal of native goodness and manhood in his character, and began to like him, and I listened to his talk till I almost forgot my situation.

We lay there at the roots of that tree what seemed a very long time, when the firing began to get heavier, and our soldiers got to coming up closer, and I knew the reënforcements must have arrived.

The fighting was to the right of us and nearer the road, so I judged from the position of our troops that the Confederates were falling back. Toward the evening the ambulances came along and took me up, but I begged so hard for Bill Anderson, the wounded rebel, that they took him up too, and carried us both to a hospital in Fredericksburg. We were in different parts of the building, but I asked next morning that Bill be given a cot next to mine, and soon I was listening to him again. He was always original, and he never tired me.

One day I asked him why he was in the Confederate army, and he answered, half facetiously: "I belong to a place in South Carolina called Edgefield deestrict; they are a mighty pesky set of folks living around there, and I've come out here in this war to keep from gettin' shot." He was always saying something like this, and I would always laugh at the way he said it. I thought the war was a queer place to come to when one did n't care to get shot, but I remembered that

there were some pretty dangerous citizens in South Carolina, and did n't question him on this point.

Although we were very intimate he still continued to call me "Yank," and never addressed me in any other way.

Well, to go along with my story, Bill Anderson, my friend and companion, attended to his wound himself, and having a strong constitution (much stronger than mine) and a light heart (much lighter than mine), he got well rapidly, and was soon skirmishing around the hospital doing odd jobs, but always returning at night to his cot beside me. Dear Bill, how I would long to see him when evening came, and how interested I would be at his humorous recital of the little events of the day, which he always magnified by some inventions of his own. And later, when the shadows of approaching darkness had begun to fall about the room, and night was creeping on, Bill would take off his boots and coat and retire to his cot. Then in a little while, when all was silent as the tomb, and the breathing of the many sufferers could be heard, Bill would begin his sonorous snore. Dear Bill, original as thou wast in all things, thou wast doubly original in this! I would listen to him through the silent watches of the long night, when the very walls would shake and echo back his snore. But even this sound was company as I would lie awake and think of what might be going on in the great world outside.

As for myself, I was the greatest of sufferers. I was getting better, if at all, very slowly, and always thought I was growing worse. I had at times been out of my head, and then, so Bill told me, I would talk of home, and cry and go on till it made him feel bad himself. He was always attentive to my wants and inquiring after my comfort, and would get up often every night to turn me over or hold a glass of water to my thirsty lips. Sometimes at a late hour I would feel hungry, and out from under Bill's pillow would come a roast potato or a couple of biscuits that he had stolen from the table for my enjoyment. But with all Bill's attention it seemed as though I was never to get well. Every day I seemed growing weaker, and certainly more despondent, and I was wasting away to a mere shadow of my former self. I felt that I should die if I stayed where I was, and at times, in my melancholy and suffering, I envied the deep repose of the dead. I wanted to be at home, where I could

have the tender care bestowed by my wife, and hear her voice encouraging me to a speedy recovery. My little boys, too, would come about the bed to ask how Papa was, and to bring light and joy where all was anguish now.

One day I was telling Bill how unhappy I was, and that I should be sure to die if I stayed in the hospital any longer, when he asked me earnestly where I wanted to go, saying that he would get me away if he got killed for doing it. I told him that my home was just outside of Philadelphia, and that if I could get to that city, I would write to my wife, and she would come and take me, and then I would soon recover and go back to my regiment.

"All right, Yank," he said; "if you are willin', I'll have you down to that Philadelphia train at twelve o'clock to-morrow night."

I asked him how he would manage to do it, and he said:

"I have a friend who is a perfect gentleman. He is a butcher, and furnishes meat to this hospital. I will borrow his cart, fill it full of straw, and when everybody is asleep, I will lift you up in my arms and carry you downstairs to the yard, where the cart will be waiting. I will unlock all the doors beforehand, and everything will be all hookey."

I slept no more that night, and all next day I was cheerful and anxiously awaiting the hour when I should say good-bye forever to that gloomy old building. Evening came at last, and with it came Bill to cheer me once more for the last time. He told me very quietly that when he had put me on the train and returned the cart to his friend, he intended to make tracks for South Carolina if the whole war went to h—l. He said he did n't want to stay there any longer, since I was going, and that, anyhow, they would never get done with him when they learned of his stealing me away.

Toward the appointed hour Bill got noiselessly from his cot, and having on already everything but his boots, he lifted me, bedclothes and all, up in his arms, and carried me softly down the steps. We reached the cart without interruption, when Bill went back to bring my clothes and boots, which latter he said he would have to take as his were about worn out. I gave them to him gladly, dear fellow, and he pulled them on, got on the cart, and we were on our way to where the cars would soon stop. Bill was well known about the depot as an attendant at the hospital, so when we arrived

there a few minutes before the train, and Bill bought my ticket to Philadelphia with money I had in my clothes, it excited no suspicion. The few persons around supposed that Bill had orders to see me safe on the train, and they scarcely noticed our arrival, though my appearance, wrapped up as I was, would ordinarily have provoked comment.

While I lay there musing and waiting, I asked Bill what he thought would be the outcome of the war; whether in his opinion the Union or Confederate army would be victorious. He answered in his original way, and with a sort of pious patriotism:

"If the Lord is for General Lee, General Lee will win; but if the Lord is agin General Lee, then it 's going to be a mighty hard tussle."

Bill evidently had a great deal of faith in General Lee, but so did even his enemies.

The train was on time, and Bill was soon helping me in and arranging me comfortably for my long journey. When the moment came to say good-bye, Bill for the first time broke down completely, and as he wept like a child I threw my arms around his neck, and drawing his head up to mine hugged him affectionately and wept too. The train had started when he said good-bye the last time, and as it sped on through the night I thought of Bill and blubbered as though my heart would break. Dear, noble fellow, how I loved him! Dearer even than a brother, I can see him now, the same frank, generous soul, willing to do all in all for me, and bearing me always in his heart of hearts. Dear Bill, you can never be forgotten, and as long as my heart shall beat in memory of anyone, it shall beat in memory of you. You stood by me, a loving friend, when I was sick, heartbroken, and lonely; when I could offer you nothing to reward your tender ministrations of affection; when the whole earth seemed black with shadows, clouds, and darkness. You were an unselfish man at all hours and all times, and though I have lived many years, I have seen none that resembles you.

The old gentleman's memory seemed so completely absorbed in the recollections of the past, that he appeared to forget his little audience as he delivered this rhapsody on his friend of bygone years.

We were all silent, and after a moment he bowed his head and resumed the story.

Well, I reached Philadelphia without accident or interruption, where I was kindly cared for until I could send a message to my wife, who came quickly, and soon had me at home once again. I recovered rapidly under her attentions, and at the beginning of winter I was back with my company, strong and healthy.

Through the remainder of the war I served without injury, though in some pretty hot skirmishes, and at its close I was mustered in my present regiment.

Years went by, many years of uneventful army life, and in the winter of 1882 my command was stationed at Fort A———, Montana, right among the Black Hills, and in the most out-of-the-way section of the country. During the many years that had elapsed since the events I have been relating, I had often thought tenderly of my loved friend Bill Anderson, and had often told the story that I have been telling you, to my friends and brother officers.

The friendship that had so romantically sprung up between this brave Confederate soldier and me — sprung up in the very furrows of war — had softened my heart toward the South and blotted out forever all the harsh feelings that had ever entered my breast. I began to see things as I should see them, and to entertain a growing respect for the loyal men of that section who had been willing to die for an opinion, simply because they believed it to be right, and ready to endure the hardships of war, the pain, disaster, and mental suffering which it entails, with no prospect of earthly reward to lighten the tomb. When a man is willing to die for an opinion, however illogical that opinion may be, he can always command my respect. The Confederate soldier who marched out for the cause he would uphold; who went away from all the joy and sweetness and hope of life, to do, to suffer, to bleed, and to die for the flag of his allegiance and the country of his love, need fear no word of reproach from the lips of honorable men. However, I am wandering from my story.

I was saying that I often thought of my old friend Bill Anderson. Yes, I thought of him many a time, dear fellow, and wondered too if he ever thought of me. I had for many years been making inquiries of people from South Carolina whom I chanced to meet, but no one seemed to know this

particular Bill Anderson. I had even written to the postmaster at the town near which he lived, but only to be disappointed at the information that no such person lived in that vicinity. Poor Bill! I at last began to think he must be dead, and that probably he never reached his home after bidding me good-bye on the train. It was a long way to walk from northern Virginia to South Carolina, and in times so stormy as 1864, extremely dangerous. Perhaps he was murdered or starved to death, or perhaps, weary of wending his way through tangled swamps and treacherous morasses, he had lain down by the wayside and calmly given up his life. Well, these thoughts would trouble me and prompt more inquiries as to his fate, but always without success, and I finally indulged no hope of ever meeting him in this mortal life.

Out in Montana, where, as I said, I was stationed, the winters are always severe, and the blizzards that sweep its frozen hills and paint upon the landscape a picture of solemn desolation, were never fiercer and more pitiless than in 1882. The freezing winds would shriek and groan, week in and week out; the snow would whirl and shudder to the ground, day after day, night after night, till one would wonder where it would all go when the spring came.

Toward the last of this awful winter, in noisy, blustering March, I was in my sitting-room early one evening when I heard a knock on the door, and upon my calling "Come in," the sergeant of the guard entered.

"Colonel," said he, saluting, "ther's a man in the guard-room who says he wants to speak to you, and as he volunteered to come over here, I thought I would find out if you would be bothered with him."

"Who is the man?" I asked.

"I don't know his name, Colonel," replied the sergeant, "but he arrived at the post about an hour ago, saying he had been walking all day, and asked permission to sleep in the guard-room. I went to see the officer of the day, and he said that as it was so cold, and the poor devil might freeze to death if without a fire, I might let him stay till morning. Well, after he had warmed himself, he got to talking and said he was trying to get to the Simpson Mines, some forty miles from here. Then he began to ask questions about this fort and who the officers were, and when I told him your name he nearly fell off the bench he was sitting on, and said he must

see you right away. When I told him he could n't go to your house, that it was against orders, I thought he would spring on me like a wild beast and tear me to pieces. He said, 'To hell with orders,' and if I did n't see you quick for him, he would go himself. To prevent trouble, I came to see you."

From what the sergeant said I thought he must have a strange character over at the guard-room, so instead of asking him to send the man to me, I put on my cape and cap, and hurried there myself.

I entered the guard-room frowning, and standing in the middle of the floor, inquired of the tall, rough-looking stranger what business he had with me. In the uncertain light I could not well trace his features, but when he said "Don't you know me, Yank?" I knew the voice of my long-loved and lost Bill Anderson, and forgetting where I was and all things else, I wrapped him in an affectionate and long embrace. He hardly spoke, and I was so overcome with my feelings — with my delight at seeing him again after eighteen long years — that I did not know how to begin with the thousand questions that flashed through my brain. The few soldiers in the room stood looking on in blank astonishment, wondering if their colonel had gone clear crazy, in hugging a man whom they had just been feeling sorry for and would hardly have noticed under any other circumstances. Ignorant of the situation, they could not understand what this poor wanderer was to me, and the love I had cherished for him ever since I had come to realize the intense attachment which one man might learn to bear to another.

Putting my arm under Bill's arm, I hurried him over to my quarters, and while the best that the post afforded was being prepared by the cook, I hurried to tell my wife, and my children (who were now grown), and soon they were all shaking Bill's big hands, and making every suggestion for his comfort. My wife and two grown sons gazed on him with tender and loving eyes — big and rough and uncouth-looking though he was — for they had often heard me tell of the friend he had been, and knew that beneath his rough exterior beat a great, throbbing, manly heart.

He told me in a few words how he happened to get far out there beyond the limits of civilization. He said that after leaving me that night in 1864, he started at once for South Carolina, and walked all night, so that he might be a long

way from the hospital before they would miss and inquire after him. Being a Confederate soldier, and wearing the gray uniform, he had no difficulty in getting food and lodging every day and night; and in less than ten days he was at home among his people. He worked the farm his old mother had left him, for a year or more, and then, being discontented, he sold out and moved to Missouri, where his mother's relatives lived. He at once purchased another farm and worked hard, and though he found that he was making little money, he stuck to it for many years. A short while before we met, however, he yielded to the persuasive letters of a friend who had gone out to Montana and was getting rich. At the beginning of winter he had sold out his farm and everything he had on earth, and started for Simpson's Mines, situated about fifty miles from Fort A———. In Denver he had stopped for a few days, and making the acquaintance of gamblers, had been stripped to his last dollar. He had sold his watch and purchased a ticket to Bozeman, and from there, through the snow and breasting the bitter winds, he had wandered penniless to the very abode of one who cared more for him than did anyone on earth. He had hoped to be allowed to sleep by the fire in the guard-room all night, and to beg a little food in the morning, and then he expected to continue his journey to the mine where his friend was.

Of course he would not go for quite a while now, for I told him how useless it was to try any mining in the dead of winter, at a place where he would find such inadequate shelter. I begged him to make my house his home as long as he cared to, and, in any event, to wait till winter broke before starting out.

The best room in the house was assigned to him, and he grew contented and talkative, and his conversation would interest everyone at the post. He was soon a familiar figure, and as everyone knew how our friendship had begun, and had heard me speak of his manly qualities, he was looked upon with respect. Then, too, he was the colonel's guest, and his quaint stories had enhanced his popularity. I would spend a great part of my time with him, and have him accompany me whenever I went to the neighboring town. I hated to think that he was soon to go away again, for he had come to me as if risen from the grave.

Spring came after awhile, and Bill would ask queer questions about mining, and tell of the money he expected to

make, so I saw he was bent on digging quartz and that sort of thing, and making an independent living; and I told him, when I got ready I would fix him up, and send him to his destination in the ambulance. Before he left I bought him woollen shirts and strong clothing, and pick and shovel, and admonishing him to call on me if he needed anything, bade him a warm good-bye. He clung to my hands for some moments, telling me how good I had been to him, and how he would never forget my kindness (not remembering in his big heart that the debt of gratitude was on my side), and as the ambulance drove rapidly away I could see him in the distance looking back, waving his sombrero above his head.

I heard frequently from him, and now and then at the interval of a month or so he would come to visit me, always a welcome guest as long as he had a mind to stay. On one of his visits he said he had saved considerable dust, and was getting along well generally, though he and his pard had plans to make a big strike about a hundred miles further west.

Sure enough, in August he came to the post to say good-bye for a long time, as he and his partner, or "pard" as he called him, were going out to Idaho, where they would "strike it rich" and have everything their own way. He left with a light heart, and though at the end of four or five months I expected to see him, yet they came and went, and no Bill put in an appearance.

Then a year went by, and two years, and three years, and the regiment was ordered East, and still no word from the wanderer. Surely, I thought, we shall never run across one another again in this big country, especially after meeting him once under circumstances so extraordinary. Those things do not happen often in a lifetime. Beyond all doubt Bill is gone now for good; I shall see him no more.

In the winter of 1886 my wife and I visited Chicago, where we have many acquaintances, intending to put in a few weeks of pleasure and relaxation. We engaged rooms at the Palmer House, and were soon enjoying ourselves immeasurably.

About two days after our arrival, early in the evening, a servant knocked on the door, and handed to me on the silver card-receiver an engraved card, upon which appeared the modest name of "Mr. William Anderson."

I was surprised beyond expression that this prodigal should turn up again, and what, too, astonished me was, what in the

world was he doing with an engraved card? I told the servant to ask the gentleman up at once, and amused myself in the interval by getting my wife to guess who the visitor was.

In a minute there was a soft rap on the door, and at my invitation a tall gentleman entered, dressed in an elegant suit of broadcloth, carrying in his hand a silk hat and heavy gold-handled umbrella.

I saw the same old Bill, however, through all his disguises, and cordially grasping his hand and turning it over to my wife, begged him to be seated. I was delighted to see such signs of prosperity as his attire indicated, and was soon plying him with questions as to his doings since we separated in Montana.

He told me the story of his wonderful success; of the rich find that he and his pard had made; and that he had come East to buy machinery for his mines as well as to spend some of the money he had made. While carelessly looking over a newspaper he had seen my name in the society column, and had hurried around lest I should leave before he could see me. He was delighted to learn that I should be in the city several weeks.

At our suggestion he had his baggage moved to the Palmer House, and took up his quarters not in one room, but in three (its handsomest suite). To use his own expression, he could "buy and sell the whole blamed hotel." Every day he was wanting to present my wife or me with some costly present, and was all the time sending some delicacy to our rooms. He said he had plenty of money ("easy nine hundred thousand dollars"), and could afford to throw some of it away.

Now this enormous ring that attracted your attention to-night, and prompted this story, was a present he gave me as a symbol of our friendship. You see it is surmounted with a buckle.

When at last our little holiday was ended and we were starting for New York, I went to the hotel clerk to settle my account, and was politely informed that Mr. Anderson had paid it up to date. Bill would not listen to my offers to reimburse him for this outlay of several hundred dollars, and only laughed at my endeavors to make him take the money. He drove with us to the depot, and with the promise to write to me once a month, and to visit me at my home, he said good-bye. We are devoted friends to-day, and this beautiful home with its luxuries we owe to him.

And this is all I have to tell you.

NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS.

IN no previous year of its existence has THE ARENA had so bright an outlook or been so well fortified against the ills that flesh — and magazine — are heir to. Its newly acquired solid financial footing will enable this periodical to be in deed and in truth, in the future, an Open Court for the utterance of the most able and progressive thought and opinion in America; and this it intends to be.

THE article by Lawyer Choate which appeared in the January number, wherein he proposed the establishment of a "Court of Medicine and Surgery," has attracted such wide attention that hardly a newspaper in the country has been without its local discussion of the idea. Physicians, lawyers, and laymen, from Maine to California, and from Minnesota to Texas, have taken up the debate, and columns in favor of and columns opposed to the idea, have been printed.

In the February issue, THE ARENA showed its determination to present all sides by giving a Symposium of criticisms of this Medical-Court idea, in which favorable and unfavorable opinions were expressed freely by leading men in both the medical and the legal professions, aided by at least one distinguished layman.

A curious coincidence appears in the fact that *The Practitioner* for January presented the idea of "A Medical Court of Honor," which, while quite different from Mr. Choate's idea, tends to show that there is much feeling on the general proposition that something in this line is needed. Lawyers and physicians everywhere are discussing the question, and laymen are learning many interesting things.

FOLLOWING this remarkable discussion, there will appear in THE ARENA a series of papers on municipal reform, by the Mayors of some of the chief cities in America, beginning with the Mayor of Boston, whose article appears in the present issue. These papers will not be mere dry figures and statistics, but will be the vital up-to-date criticisms and suggestions of those who are best fitted to see the defects and to offer the best solutions of the difficulties surrounding good city government in America. Further reference to this subject is made below, under the heading "Mayor Josiah Quincy."

WRITERS such as ex-Minister Andrew D. White, LL.D., Gen. John Eaton, LL.D., U. S. N., Prof. Simon Newcomb, LL.D., and ex-Gov. John W. Hoyt, LL.D., are expected to contribute papers on educational subjects to early issues. Papers are also expected from Chief-Justice Fuller, ex-Gov. John Lee Carroll, General Horace Porter, Frances E. Willard, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Helen H. Gardener, Robert G. Ingersoll, and many others in this country and abroad who stand for the best and most progressive thought of the age.

A SOURCE of deep interest to women in all parts of the country is the fact that THE ARENA will put forth a strengthening word in their behalf in each month's issue. Commencing with Mary Lowe Dickinson, in the February number, a message worth hearing, from some justly famous woman, will appear each month. The article by Mrs. Dickinson was especially notable in that, as President of the National Council of Women of which she wrote, she both represents and appeals to 700,000 organized women of this country. Representing them by right of her official position, she appeals to them not only through their loyalty, but also by her ability to clearly express the principles that actuate their association. This article had the force of a special appeal to all women, and since its appearance, this has been proven in many ways. Frances E. Willard writes: "I do want all of our women to get THE ARENA, the best magazine in Christendom. Please send me a copy here." Among representative women who will write for THE ARENA in the near future may be mentioned Susan B. Anthony, May Wright Sewall, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Frances E. Willard, Ellen N. Henrotin, Mrs. (Gen.) Pickett, and others equally representative.

Mayor Josiah Quincy.

THIS issue opens with an article by Major Josiah Quincy of Boston, whose paper will be the first of a series on the subject of desirable municipal reforms from the practical outlook of the Mayors of large municipalities.

This series of papers will be one of the most important that has appeared in recent years, and it is peculiarly fitting that it should be opened by the chief magistrate of the leading municipality of New England, who is himself the descendant of a distinguished line of public men, whose name in Massachusetts ranks with that of Adams. The increasing influence of municipal power in our country in the direction of controlling State and

national politics, together with the ever-widening question of poverty, local responsibility, and safe citizenship with liberty, will make these papers of vital importance.

THE April issue of THE ARENA will contain the second of this series, which will be written by a Mayor famous for his sturdy independence and insistence of the rights of the people of his city against the encroachment of organized power or corporate oppression. The collection of the opinions of such men, who, having had practical experience in guiding the affairs of large municipalities, are in a position to write with authority in regard to both the needed changes and the difficulties to be overcome in securing such improvements, is the object of this series of papers; and, from the interest displayed since their first announcement, it is believed that they will be productive of much discussion and of great good.

Prof. Burt G. Wilder, of Cornell University.

IT is a fascinating paper by Professor Wilder, entitled "Brains for the Young." It is an argument in favor of "the desirability and feasibility of the acquisition of some real knowledge of the brain by pre-collegiate scholars." That such a topic can be made useful and full of instruction, most thinkers will be ready to admit; but that it can also be rendered as attractive and bright as a bit of fiction, Professor Wilder has demonstrated. He is a true scientist. He does not confuse, as do so many writers on the brain, hypothesis with demonstrated facts. He recognizes and states the limits of knowledge, and strengthens his case by his ability and readiness to say "I do not know," where the limit of demonstration has been reached.

Hon. John Clark Ridpath, LL.D.

THE readers of THE ARENA are too well acquainted with the forcefulness and beauty of diction of Prof. John Clark Ridpath's literary style to require a word of recommendation of anything he may present. "The Bond and the Dollar" was conceded to be the ablest argument on the side of silver or bimetallism which appeared during the late campaign. Its circulation ran into the hundred thousands. It was quoted from in every State, and used as a sort of text-book by both sides. As historian, biographer, and brochure writer he has few equals. He is a clever poet, and on any topic that he treats his diction is always that of a finished scholar. This issue contains a characteristic article from his able pen.

THE new owners of THE ARENA announce that, since the continued indisposition and the retirement of Mr. Flower from the Editorial Management, the services of Dr. John Clark Ridpath and Helen H. Gardener have been secured as Editors. This assures those who feared that the conversatives might have won over or bought over THE ARENA, that they are to be agreeably disappointed, for on all progressive topics Dr. Ridpath is a well-known radical thinker, who gives place to none in his zeal for progress and reform. Dr. Ridpath is too familiarly known to the readers of THE ARENA to need much of an introduction, but a few items of information in regard to him may be of especial interest, and can be quoted from the preface to the revised edition of his book, "The Bond and the Dollar," which contains a brief account of his life and work:

John Clark Ridpath, the historian, is a native of Putnam County, Indiana. His ancestors, on both sides, were old Virginians from before the Revolution. His childhood was passed in a frontier home. His education was obtained first in the country schools of the neighborhood, and afterward in De Pauw University, from which he was graduated with the highest honors in 1863. After six years of teaching he was elected to the professorship of English literature in his Alma Mater, and two years afterward was transferred to the chair of history and political philosophy. In 1879 he was elected vice-president of the university, and while occupying this position was chiefly instrumental in procuring the De Pauw endowment upon which the institution rests.

Professor Ridpath's career as an author began in 1876, when he published his "Academic History of the United States." This was followed by his "Grammar School History," and soon afterward by his "Popular History of the United States." The last-named work has reached a sale of nearly four hundred thousand copies. From the date of its publication the author devoted himself more and more to the preparation of historical and biographical works. In 1885 his "History of the World" was published in four volumes. This work has reached a sale of one hundred thousand sets, a most remarkable sale for so expensive and solid a work.

In the intervals of heavier composition Professor Ridpath has written several standard and popular biographies. The latest of these is "The Life and Times of William E. Gladstone," a work now in press.

In 1893 he published his "Great Races of Mankind," which is, perhaps, his most important work. "This work alone," says an eminent German professor, "would place its author in the front rank as a philosophical historian."

The publications of John Clark Ridpath now extend to fully twenty-five volumes, all of which have been received with great and solid favor by the public. Since 1885 he has devoted himself altogether to authorship. In that year he resigned his professorship and vice-presidency in the university and began to be exclusively a literary man. He had already acquired a wide reputation as a public speaker, lecturer, and writer on various subjects of general concern. He is to-day in the very front rank in both scholarship and general culture, and is regarded as a thinker of rare powers.

He has always been deeply interested in the welfare of the country and the progress of society. His writings are those of a patriot and a publicist. His chief concern has been to contribute something of merit and inspiration to the age in which he lives. His recent appearance in the political field was not of his own choosing, but was the result of a public movement which he could not control.

The present publication ["The Bond and the Dollar"] is his appeal to the people. It is directed to the country at large, and only incidentally to the people of his own State and district. It is in the light of these considerations that this publication, which has already reached its one hundredth edition and is believed by many to be the most important contribution thus far put forth in the interest of the financial independence of the American people, is to be read and understood.

Helen H. Gardener.

PUBLIC mention has not hitherto been made of the fact that Helen H. Gardener, who has been engaged as co-Editor of THE ARENA with Dr. John Clark Ridpath, has done all the editorial work on the January, February, and March issues of this Magazine. There are few, if any, women who, even if they possessed the requisite ability, would care to assume a work so important and so responsible.

It is believed that no great review or magazine in the United States has ever before been edited by a woman, or has been sufficiently progressive to recognize woman's ability in a position of such practical importance. It is a high compliment to Helen H. Gardener, and it also speaks well for the intelligence of the proprietors of the Arena Company, that she has been engaged as co-Editor with Dr. Ridpath.

The readers of THE ARENA know who Helen H. Gardener is, and what her editorial connection with THE ARENA implies, and it is unnecessary to give her further introduction.

A National University for the United States.

THE proposal to establish a great national "University of the United States" has been agitated for over a century, among its first advocates having been no less a person than George Washington himself, who by his last will devised land and bequeathed a handsome sum of money in aid of the scheme; but up to a recent date little if anything had been done to give practical effect to the proposal. Not long ago, however, there was begun an effort, which is now in progress, to make a commencement; and a "Committee of One Hundred" has been formed in Washington, D. C., of which ex-Governor Hoyt, LL.D., is chairman, with the determination to carry the project through to a successful consummation. Among the sixteen members of the executive council of this Committee are such men as Chief Justice Fuller, Sena-

tor Edmunds, Hon. Andrew D. White, Ex-Governor John Lee Carroll, Gen. Horace Porter, Gen. John Eaton, Dr. Simon Newcomb, etc. The present number of THE ARENA contains an admirable article by ex-Governor Hoyt, the chairman of the Committee, giving a detailed history of the movement from its inception by "the Father of his Country" down to the present time, together with a detailed account of the kind of institution which it is proposed to establish. The article should be read by everyone interested in this magnificent scheme to found at the national capital a great national university, in every respect worthy of the country which it will represent.

A STRONG and scholarly paper on "The Past and Future of the American Negro," written by Dr. Culp, an able representative of his race, will be a prominent feature of the April ARENA. It was unavoidably crowded out of this issue, but will deeply interest the readers of the April number.

HARYOT HOLT CAHOON will doubtless cause some excitement among the journalists by her vigorous paper in this number, entitled "Women in Gutter Journalism." The public will be divided in its opinion of her strictures, but it will not fail to see that she has a strong case.

OUR American as well as our Canadian readers will be interested in the excellent paper by J. W. Russell on the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, the recently appointed Premier of Canada, since it is the first time since the confederation of Canada in 1867 that a Frenchman has filled that office. The Montreal correspondent of the New York *World*, in commenting recently upon the ability and strength of the Canadian Liberal leader, said: "There is a practical declaration of war between the Roman Catholic Church, and the Liberal party, headed by the Premier, Wilfrid Laurier, in the Province of Quebec. The five bishops of the province have come out unanimously with a *mandement*, read in all of the churches, forbidding the faithful to read, sell, work on, or countenance the existence of the paper called *L'Electeur*. The *mandement* advised all Catholics not to read newspapers that indorsed the settlement of the school question in Manitoba."

Commercial union with the United States is said to be one of the dreams of Premier Laurier. He is also said to regard it as "quite as important to have a permanent representative of the Dominion government in Washington as to have one in London, because Sir Julian Pauncefote is required to attend to the business of Great Britain and all her colo-

nies, and cannot devote the time and attention to the interests of Canada that their growing importance deserves." A study of this man's life and personality by one who has been near him is especially timely.

Mrs. Pickett.

Our readers this month are treated to a delightfully told story founded on an incident of the late war. Mrs. Pickett, its author, has won a reputation as a writer on negro folklore second only to that of Joel Chandler Harris; and that she is destined to achieve an enviable reputation as a writer of historical romance, all who read her sketch, "An Olive Branch of the Civil War," will agree. It will add interest to announce that the author is the widow of General Pickett, of Gettysburg fame, the fearless leader of the Southern forces on that memorable day which decided the fate of the nation. By both the Blue and the Gray, "Pickett's Charge" is referred to as one of the grand examples of sublime courage displayed between the contending forces during the war, and it will be one of the tragic incidents to be remembered by future generations. It will take rank with the "Charge of the Six Hundred."

Mrs. Pickett's personal knowledge of the war and of army life enables her to present a picture drawn from an experience that but few possess.

May Wright Sewall.

May Wright Sewall, ex-President of the National Council of Women of the United States, and founder and principal of the classical school for girls, Indianapolis, will contribute to the April number a timely and effective article on the subject of co-education in secondary schools and colleges, and of the new ideas which are growing up in the new universities. Mrs. Sewall has had the benefit of a diversified and extended education, and also has been an educator continuously throughout her adult life. Her attention is ever bent upon all that comprises or tends to make better the methods of education, and the fact that she is an expert in the line of her lifework and thoroughly conversant with the ground of her observation, gives value to anything she writes on the subject.

Mrs. Sewall's article was to have appeared in this issue, but she courteously gave place to the able presentation by ex-Governor Hoyt of the case of the proposed National University, so that his contribution might appear, with peculiar timeliness, on Washington's birthday.

Prof. Joseph Le Conte.

One of the most important contributions to this issue is the

article by Professor Le Conte, of the University of California, on "The Relation of Biology to Philosophy," dealing with the latest aspects of the theory of organic evolution, especially as affecting questions of philosophy and religion. Professor Le Conte is well known as one of the great masters on the subject of the evolution philosophy, and his paper should be read with the profoundest interest, not only by members of the worlds of science and philosophy, but also by the general reader, seeing that the relation of religion to the theory of evolution is undoubtedly the most momentous speculative question of the age.

Dr. A. C. True.

ANOTHER important contribution to this issue is the article by Dr. True, Director of the Office of Experimental Stations, United States Department of Agriculture, on "The Solidarity of Town and Farm," dealing in an interesting and thoroughly practical way with the subject of the tendency of the inhabitants of the country to crowd into the already overcrowded cities. This question, involving as it does that of the abolition of the city slums, is undoubtedly one of the most difficult with which statesmanship or philanthropy, or both, will have to deal in the near future, and the sooner the better; for the longer it is neglected the more difficult will it become to grapple with it successfully.

Dr. True's suggested solution of this knotty problem should be carefully studied by all who are interested in efforts looking to the amelioration of the lot of our poorer fellow-citizens, and ultimately to the extinction of poverty. His article will be especially interesting if read in connection with the series written by the Mayors who are dealing with another phase of the same vital problem.

Camille Flammarion.

THIS eminent French astronomer and psychologist contributes to the current number a striking article on "The Prevision of the Future," detailing a number of apparently well-authenticated cases in which future events seem to have been foretold or foreseen, either in dreams or in day visions or hallucinations. An article of this kind, coming from such a source, should be of the deepest interest to all students of mental science and psychic phenomena.

MR. M. H. GULESIAN, the well-known Armenian manufacturer of Boston, Mass., gives a sympathetic account of the measures taken for the relief of the Armenian refugees who have come to this country, especially of those who have come to Boston.

Among the other valuable contributions to this issue is the official "Appeal," issued by a body of artists who have recently established a Socialistic colony in France, apparently in the neighborhood of Paris. It is intended to be self-supporting, and artists from any part of the world will be welcome to join it. The experiment appears to be somewhat in the nature of the memorable one at Brook Farm, and it will undoubtedly be watched with interest by the whole civilized world.

That the founders of this remarkable colony should have selected The Arena as the medium of their appeal, is a new proof of the recognition by all classes that this Magazine is the friend of all honest effort and progressive endeavor.

Prof. Frank Parsons.

The valuable paper on "Compulsory Arbitration," by Prof. Frank Parsons, shows the need of some more just and peaceful means than strikes and boycotts for adjusting the difficulties that arise between employers and employed, especially in the case of railroads, telegraphs, street railways, and other quasi-public institutions. It also gives many facts and figures showing the successful use of labor courts in other countries. The Chicago strike and the National Commission's report upon it called emphatic attention to the question of the judicial determination of industrial difficulties; and during the negotiations between Great Britain and the United States for the creation of an International Court of Arbitration to do away with war between nation and nation, the feeling has been growing that perhaps we might abolish civil wars between great corporations and their employees by establishing courts to arbitrate their differences. The article by Professor Parsons deals quite fully with the reasons for and against the establishment of industrial courts, and contains a number of important arguments that cannot be found elsewhere. The paper is especially timely in view of the inter-collegiate debate on Compulsory Arbitration that is to take place in Philadelphia on the sixth of March between Cornell and Pennsylvania universities.

PRAY YOU, SIR, WHOSE DAUGHTER?

By HELEN H. GARDENER.

Every legislator in every state should read it and ask his conscience whether, if such iniquitous laws are on the statute books of his state, he should not hasten to move their repeal.—*Public Opinion.*

Price, cloth, $1.00. Paper, 50 cents.

THE ARENA COMPANY,

COPLEY SQUARE, BOSTON, MASS.